

APR 08 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90054 through 11-26-90056

ORDER

An individual has filed a Complaint against three United States circuit 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 her Complaint, she filed three supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed an employment-discrimination complaint against two defendants, which a district judge dismissed. After additional proceedings, the district judge denied multiple motions Complainant filed seeking relief from judgment due to alleged fraud on the court committed by the

defendants' attorney. On appeal, a panel composed of the Subject Judges affirmed, determining in part that her Rule 60 motion was "patently frivolous." Complainant has filed petitions for panel rehearing and rehearing en banc, which remain pending.

Complaint

Complainant alleges the Subject Judges were biased, improperly determined the appeal was patently frivolous to prevent it from being reheard en banc, and concealed fraud on the court committed by the defendants' attorney. She asks "what reason would the Judges say it is frivolous other than being bribed and protecting [the attorney's] reputation."

Supplements

In her supplemental filings, Complainant provides documents that she asserts establish that her case was not frivolous and show the attorney's fraudulent statements. She alleges that the Subject Judges concealed fraud upon the court and were bribed by the attorney.

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, rulings, determinations, and opinion in Complainant’s appeal, 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 acted with an illicit or improper motive, were biased, concealed fraud, accepted a bribe, 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