

# The Judicial Council

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

In the Matter of

Judicial Council Complaint No. DC-16-90042

No. DC-16-90043

No. DC-16-90044

A CHARGE OF JUDICIAL  
MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY

Before: HENDERSON, *Circuit Judge*\*

## ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, filed against a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and two judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, it is

**ORDERED** that the complaint be dismissed for the reasons stated in the attached Memorandum. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii), (iii); JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 11(c)(1)(B), (D).

The Circuit Executive is directed to send copies of this Order and accompanying Memorandum to the complainant, the subject judges, and the Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b); JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 11(g)(2).



Karen LeCraft Henderson, Circuit Judge  
District of Columbia Circuit

Date: 12/8/16

---

\* Acting pursuant to Rule 25(f) of the RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS.

## MEMORANDUM

Complainant has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and two judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. For the following reasons, the misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

In 1992, the two subject appellate judges were on a panel that summary affirmed a district court order dismissing complainant's civil action against the Department of Justice and others. In 2016, complainant filed a judicial misconduct complaint.

Complainant alleges that the subject judges "engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts" and violated his constitutional rights through "prejudicial and discriminatory and unconstitutional conduct." To the extent these allegations are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling," they are not cognizable misconduct under the governing statute and rules. JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 3(h)(3)(A). The allegations otherwise "lack sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 11(c)(1)(D). Therefore, the judicial misconduct complaint must be dismissed. JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 11(c)(1)(B), (D); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii), (iii).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(c) and JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, Rule 18(a), the complainant may file a petition for review by the Judicial Council for the District of Columbia Circuit. Any petition must be filed in the Office of the Circuit Executive for the D.C. Circuit within 42 days of the date of the dismissal order. *Id.* Rule 18(b).