

JUN 23 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90086

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 23rd day of June, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

MAY 13 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90086

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.

As an initial matter, after Complainant filed his Complaint, he filed 11 supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants and several amended complaints, and the Subject Judge later struck the unauthorized amended complaints. Complainant filed multiple motions seeking various types of relief, including a motion to partially stay the proceedings, and the Subject Judge entered an order staying the case

until a status conference was held. Complainant continued to file documents, and the Subject Judge entered orders striking the documents and stating that violations of the orders could result in him being placed on a restricted-filer list. The Subject Judge later recused herself from the case, which remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge engaged in “non-judicial acts, ex parte communications, evidence suppression, retaliatory threats, and actions taken in the complete absence of jurisdiction” He alleges the Subject Judge engaged in *ex parte* communications with defense counsel, as shown by an email from counsel that stated, “After I brought your continuous filing of frivolous motions to the Magistrate’s [sic] attention... the Judge struck all of your recent filings” and “I am going to bring your email to the Federal Court conference on [a certain date] and raise it with the Judge.” Complainant contends the email confirms that the Subject Judge engaged in undisclosed communications, coordinated with counsel to strike filings, planned a future *ex parte* meeting, and violated a canon of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.

Next, Complainant states the Subject Judge, without a legal basis and without jurisdiction, imposed a “full stay” despite that he requested only a “partial stay,” and he alleges the Subject Judge concealed, suppressed, and tampered with evidence by striking filings during the stay. He asserts he is the victim of multiple crimes and alleges that the Subject Judge retaliated against him by threatening to designate him as a restricted filer during the “void stay.”

He also alleges the Subject Judge denied him reasonable accommodations and selectively enforced rules. Finally, Complainant contends the Subject Judge's actions undermined public confidence in the judiciary, obstructed his access to the courts, created an appearance of coordination with one party, and are not protected by judicial immunity. He attached documents to his Complaint, including an affidavit in which he alleges the Subject Judge was biased against him.

Supplements

In his 11 supplements, Complainant states he does not consent to his Complaint materials being maintained as confidential, alleges that evidence has been tampered with and destroyed, states he is in physical danger, requests various types of relief, and provides various documents.

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 above-described 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 biased, engaged in improper *ex parte* communications, retaliated against him, violated the Code of Conduct for United States 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