

OCT 29 2025

CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Judicial Council of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90119 and 11-25-90120

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 29 day of October, 2025.

FOR THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL:

/s/ Robin S. Rosenbaum
United States Circuit Judge

JUL 25 2025

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-25-90119 and 11-25-90120

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against a United States district judge and 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.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against multiple defendants, and he later filed a second amended complaint in which he named a United States Attorney for a certain district as an individual defendant. After the Subject Magistrate Judge was assigned to the case, Complainant filed a motion to recuse her, arguing in part that she had a conflict of interest because she served as an Assistant United States Attorney in the same office as the defendant. The Subject Magistrate Judge entered an order denying the motion to recuse, stating that she neither

participated in nor expressed an opinion on the merits of the case in her previous role, and that she would fairly and impartially adjudicate any matter referred to her in the case. Complainant filed objections to the order, and the Subject District Judge entered an order overruling the objections. The case remains pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Magistrate Judge had a conflict of interest but refused to recuse herself from the case despite that she was “an employee of a Defendant,” and “worked with, accepted money from, and socialized extensively with” the defendant. Complainant states the Subject Magistrate Judge worked “side by side” with the defendant, he “was her boss, and it was his recommendations” that helped her become a magistrate judge, and Complainant predicts the Subject Magistrate Judge will rely on the defendant’s recommendations in the future. Complainant further states the Subject Magistrate Judge “may have been involved in the actions of Defendant ... that got him sued in this case” and that her “neutrality was compromised.” He alleges the Subject Magistrate Judge “perjured herself” in her order denying the motion to recuse. Complainant alleges the Subject District Judge is corrupt and “approved this refusal to recuse.” Finally, Complainant takes issue with this Court’s decisions in other Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability matters, and he contends that the judges of this Court are corrupt.

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 Judges’ official actions, findings, rulings, and orders in the above-described case, the allegations are directly related to the merits of the Subject Judges’ 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 had a conflict of interest, were not impartial, committed perjury, 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