

JUN 24 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint No. 11-26-90117

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 Complainant filed a civil complaint under the Federal Tort Claims Act, and the case was assigned to a judge who is not the Subject Judge. The defendant moved to dismiss the case, and the Subject Judge granted the motion and ruled that Complainant’s claims violated a prefiling injunction imposed in another action. The order modified the injunction to prevent further vexatious conduct. This Court affirmed.

The record also establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against two defendants, and the Subject Judge dismissed

the complaint as an attempted end run of the pre-filing injunctions. This Court vacated the dismissal and remanded for further proceedings. The defendants then moved to dismiss the action, and the Subject Judge granted the motion. This Court affirmed.

Complaint

Complainant contends the Subject Judge improperly modified a pre-filing injunction without jurisdiction, “tampered with a case not assigned to him,” attempted to cover up an illegal “ban,” fraudulently dismissed a case, and violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. 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 Complainant's 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, committed fraud, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, or engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.
Chief Judge