

JUL 28 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90095

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 28th day of July, 2026.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum

United States Circuit Judge

MAY 29 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90095

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 two supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that two plaintiffs filed a civil complaint against Complainant in state court, he removed the case to federal court, and the plaintiffs moved to remand the case. After Complainant filed additional motions, the Subject Judge ordered him not to file any motions until the court had ruled on the motion to remand. The plaintiffs then filed a motion for leave to conduct

jurisdictional discovery, which the Subject Judge granted. Complainant filed objections and a motion for reconsideration, which the Subject Judge overruled or denied. The case remains pending.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against two defendants, two amended complaints, a request for an emergency hearing, and a motion for a preliminary injunction. The defendants moved to dismiss that action, and on the same day, the Subject Judge ordered Complainant to file a response in opposition if he opposed the motion. The case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge knowingly granted a motion for discovery that falsely stated it had been served before the case had been filed, which was evidence of “willful blindness.” He alleges the Subject Judge “ignore[d] documented fraud to force an outcome” and “cho[se] to proceed with a falsified and incomplete record.” He also asserts that the “record reveals a pattern of intentional manipulation of the public docket,” and he states “the Clerk and the Court have willfully suppressed jurisdictional facts from the record.” He attached documents to his Complaint.

Supplements

In his first supplemental filing, Complainant reiterates his allegations, takes issue with the processing of his documents, and provides “evidence of the ongoing docket manipulation and clerical suppression” and proof of “active tampering with the record.” He alleges that the Subject Judge ignored evidence of fraud,

“effectively gagged” him by ordering him not to file any motions until the remand issue was resolved, was biased against him, gave preferential treatment to the plaintiffs’ attorney, ruled on the plaintiffs’ motions quickly while ignoring his requests for emergency hearings, and violated state statutes. He also takes issue with the actions of other individuals.

In the second supplemental filing, Complainant contends that “the suppression of evidence in the federal court is the continuation of an illegal, multi-jurisdictional scheme.” He alleges that the Subject Judge “is currently enforcing orders and discovery based on a state court record that was illegally manipulated *after* the federal automatic stay was enacted.” He also takes issue with the actions of other individuals. He attached documents to both supplements.

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 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, gave preferential treatment to others, 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