

APR 24 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90071

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States district 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 a federal grand jury returned an indictment charging Complainant with multiple crimes. The government filed an *in camera* application for an *ex parte* order to disclose certain tax returns and return information because the information could not reasonably be obtained from another source in a form admissible at trial, and the Subject Judge granted the motion. A jury later found Complainant guilty as charged in the indictment, and the Subject Judge sentenced him to a term of imprisonment.

Complaint

Complainant takes issue with the Subject Judge's order granting the government's application for an *ex parte* order to disclose tax returns and tax information on the ground that the government's motion contained an "irrefutable misrepresentation of the facts." He contends that the Subject Judge knew or should have known that the government committed a crime by revealing his tax returns and tax information to a grand jury and at trial, disregarded the criminal conduct, conspired to further the commission of a felony, aided and abetted the crime, and obstructed justice.

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge failed to declare a mistrial or to conduct a proper investigation upon learning that a prosecutor had a conversation with a juror during the case. He alleges the Subject Judge failed to act upon evidence that he was being unlawfully detained and maliciously prosecuted. Complainant contends the Subject Judge lengthened his sentence based on his "non-existent parole status" and told him to "take these matters up with the parole board" when the parole board had no authority or jurisdiction over him. He attached documents to his 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 the case, 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, was part of a conspiracy, obstructed justice, 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