

MAY 20 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90082

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States magistrate 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 the Subject Judge has been assigned to multiple cases Complainant filed and issued orders denying motions to proceed *in forma pauperis*, an order denying a motion to file electronically, reports recommending that cases be dismissed, and a report recommending that a case be remanded to state court.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge engaged in “the systematic deployment of financial expertise to gatekeep access to the federal courts.” He alleges the Subject Judge deliberately engaged in “double-counting, reclassification of necessities as discretionary, omission of material obligations, circular analytical frameworks ... not to accurately assess a litigant’s financial position, but to construct a misleading financial picture that justifies a predetermined denial of access to court.” He alleges the Subject Judge is preventing his constitutional claims from being reviewed, created an appearance of bias, and undermined public confidence in the proceedings. Complainant contends the Subject Judge penalized him for using the court’s *in forma pauperis* form, denied him access to electronic filing to increase his discretionary costs, and was “indifferent to the arithmetic” by finding that \$350 was sufficient to pay a \$410 fee. He states that an order acknowledged that *pro se* litigants may access the court’s electronic-filing system upon a showing of good cause but then denied his request because a case-by-case examination would be an unwise investment of court resources. He contends those “positions are irreconcilable.”

Complainant alleges that two district judges affirmed the Subject Judge’s reports and recommendations on the same day, “one without engaging any arguments and the other adopting her language verbatim,” which suggested that the Subject Judge prepared the district judges’ orders. He also takes issue with a statement in one of the district judge’s orders concerning his credibility. Finally, he states the Subject Judge’s conduct is part of a “pattern

that has involved over a dozen judicial officers across five court systems.” He attached a copy of a judicial complaint that he previously filed.

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, reports, recommendations, and orders in his 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, was biased, prepared orders issued by other judges, 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