

JUL 28 2026

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90103

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

JUN 05 2016

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90103

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 her Complaint, she filed 20 supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed an “emergency” civil complaint against multiple defendants, a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and a request for injunctive relief. The Subject Judge entered orders denying emergency consideration of the complaint because she had not presented a “true emergency” and denying her request for injunctive relief. Complainant filed

another request for injunctive relief, which the Subject Judge denied. The Subject Judge then denied Complainant's *in forma pauperis* motion and dismissed the complaint.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judge obstructed justice, violated her civil rights, was not impartial, and was part of a "criminal conspiracy ... designed to obstruct my legal rights, inflict economic devastation, and physically endanger my 12-year-old daughter and me." She also takes issue with the processing of her documents, complains she was not provided with an interpreter, alleges she is under surveillance, and takes issue with the actions of others. She attached documents to her Complaint.

Supplements

After she filed her Complaint, Complainant filed 20 supplements in which she takes issue with the actions of various individuals and seeks to stay eviction proceedings. In one supplemental filing, she states that her Complaint "is not merely a complaint about federal officials abusing their power," but "is the exposure of a highly coordinated, terrorist-like network comprising wealthy syndicates, organized crime rings, and potential pedophile/trafficking networks." In another, she states that the Subject Judge's "willful refusal" to grant her injunctive relief "has directly emboldened the respondents to escalate their retaliation." In other supplements, Complainant alleges the Subject Judge engaged in "calculated judicial delay" to cover up actions being taken against her and falsely stated a filing did not constitute an emergency.

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.

Furthermore, Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2) provides that cognizable misconduct does not include “an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” The “Commentary on Rule 4” states that “a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as 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 not impartial, was part of a conspiracy, 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