

JUN 20 2025

David J. Smith  
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the  
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

---

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90093 and 11-25-90094

---

**ORDER**

An individual has filed a Complaint against two United States district judges 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 a supplemental statement. The filing of the supplemental statements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

**Background**

The record establishes that Complainant filed two civil complaints against the Subject Judges and others, and he also filed multiple motions seeking various types of relief in each case, including a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and a motion to recuse the Subject Judges. In each case, the First Subject Judge entered orders

denying the motion to recuse, denying the *in forma pauperis* motion, and dismissing the case for failure to pay the filing fee.

The record also establishes the Complainant filed civil complaint against multiple defendants and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The First Subject Judge entered orders denying the *in forma pauperis* motion and dismissing the case for failure to pay the filing fee.

### **Complaint**

Complainant alleges the First Subject Judge was responsible for undue delay the above-described cases, “dismissed the cases as part of a racially motivated retaliation against me,” conspired with others to “target me for severe emotional distress” and to violate his constitutional and civil rights, committed treason and fraud upon the court, caused a manifest injustice, abused her position and the judicial process, violated her oath of office, violated the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and committed crimes. Complainant contends the First Subject Judge intentionally failed to recuse herself from two cases where she was named as a defendant, ignored motions, and “dismissed the cases due to a conflict of interest, personal interest, favor[i]tism for adverse parties in the cases, and personal bias against me because of my skin color, race, gender, and age.” Complainant states, “It is my belie[f] that being able to avoid possible jail time motivated [the First Subject Judge’s] judicial misconduct.” He also states the First Subject Judge refused to inform the court that a certain court administrator and defendant was her relative. He does not raise any specific allegations

against the Second Subject Judge. He attached documents to his Complaint.

### **Supplement**

In his supplement, Complainant alleges that seven other federal judges participated in a “racially motivated scheme” against him, “committed a pattern of racketeering,” neglected to prevent “malicious acts from occurring,” and were “part of an enterprise that commits fraud upon the court, fraud, mail fraud, racketeering, political corruption, treason, misprision of treason, Insurrection, Inciting to insurrection, advocating overthrow of government, violation of oath of office, collusion, conspiracy, Obstruction of justice, conspiracy to commit obstruction of justice, malfeasance in office, and Hate crimes.” He also alleges the judges “received kickbacks in exchange for their participation that includes large sums of cash and luxury gifts from defendants in the cases and from other directors of the enterprise.”

### **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 First Subject Judge's official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the above-described cases, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the First 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 Judges or the other judges named in the supplement engaged in misconduct. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D). For these reasons, this Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

/s/ William H. Pryor Jr.  
Chief Judge