

JUN 23 2026

David J. Smith
Clerk

CONFIDENTIAL

Before the Chief Judge of the
Eleventh Judicial Circuit

Judicial Complaint Nos. 11-26-90115 and 11-26-90116

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 her Complaint, she filed 12 supplements. The filing of the supplements is permitted. *See* 11th Cir. JCDR 6.7.

Background

The record establishes that Complainant filed a civil complaint against two defendants and a motion for a temporary restraining order, which the First Subject Judge denied. Complainant then filed a motion to recuse, and the First Subject Judge denied

the motion and dismissed the case based on the defendants' immunity.

Complaint

Complainant alleges that the First Subject Judge failed to act timely on emergency filings, engaged in "bullying and defamation of character," created an appearance of "unequal treatment and selective enforcement," and engaged in actions that "created an appearance of procedural unfairness, lack of impartiality, and failure to properly administer post-judgment enforcement responsibilities." Complainant also complains the Second Subject Judge "fail[ed] to recuse [the First Subject Judge] when requested."

Supplements

In her supplemental filings, Complainant does not raise any specific allegations concerning the Subject Judges.

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 case, 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 were not impartial 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