

JUL 17 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90057

ORDER

Before: ROSENBAUM, NEWSOM, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges; BEAVERSTOCK and WINSOR, Chief District Judges.

Pursuant to 11th Cir. JCDR 18.3, this Judicial Council Review Panel has considered the materials described in JCDR 18(c)(2), including petitioner's complaint, the order of Chief United States Circuit Judge William H. Pryor Jr., and the petition for review filed by petitioner. No judge on this panel has requested that this matter be placed on the agenda of a meeting of the Judicial Council.

The Judicial Council Review Panel hereby AFFIRMS the disposition of this matter by Chief Judge Pryor. The petition for review is DENIED.

Done this 17th day of July, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

APR 08 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90057

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States bankruptcy judge under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a voluntary petition for Chapter 7 bankruptcy, and she later filed an adversary complaint against multiple defendants seeking to collect on an arbitration award. The Subject Judge entered an order dismissing the adversary complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, or in the alternative, abstaining from considering the complaint. Complainant filed an objection to the order and moved to recuse the Subject Judge, both of which the Subject Judge denied.

Complainant later moved to reopen the case, and the Subject Judge denied the motion. Both cases are closed.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge coordinated with the Chapter 7 Trustee to commit fraud upon the court, intentionally manipulated the record, ignored conflicts of interest, and “suppressed evidence of financial deposits to obstruct the enforcement of a binding arbitration award.” Complainant contends that the Subject Judge “improperly questioned the arbitration contract’s validity,” and she states she is “now being retaliated against and discriminated against solely because of the identity of the government agencies she sued.” Complainant alleges that a financial administrator informed her that a bill of exchange was collected upon, but the Subject Judge falsely claimed that no funds existed. She alleges the Subject Judge dismissed the adversary proceedings “by falsely claiming the Trustee had not abandoned the claim.”

Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge issued a discharge order the day after the court received her amended complaint, and that the clerk’s office backdated the receipt date “to not make it look so obvious that the court was discriminating against me and the fact that ... she ignored a pending filing,” and to “avoid a recusal motion.” Complainant states she sent a letter to the bankruptcy court to show that mail delay was not her fault, and the court sent the letter to the district court, which was a “transparent attempt to omit evidence from the Bankruptcy record and make it appear as though the documents were misfiled.” She also states

that another document she filed was intentionally withheld and docketed after she “confronted the intake manager.” She takes issue with the actions of other individuals, and she attached documents to her Complaint.

Discussion

Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(1) provides in part that “[c]ognizable misconduct does not include an allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge’s ruling, including a failure to recuse.” The Commentary on Rule 4 explains the rationale for this rule as follows:

Rule 4(b)(1) tracks the Act, 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii), in excluding from the definition of misconduct allegations “[d]irectly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling.” This exclusion preserves the independence of judges in the exercise of judicial authority by ensuring that the complaint procedure is not used to collaterally call into question the substance of a judge’s decision or procedural ruling. Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge — without more — is merits-related.

The Complaint fails to present a basis for a finding of misconduct. To the extent Complainant’s allegations concern the substance of the Subject Judge’s official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in Complainant’s cases, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judge’s decisions or procedural rulings. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). Complainant’s remaining claims

are based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that the Subject Judge acted with an illicit or improper motive, coordinated with others to commit fraud upon the court, retaliated or discriminated against her, made false statements, or otherwise engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge