

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

In the Matter of
A Complaint of Judicial
Misconduct or Disability

Complaint Nos. DC-24-90015
DC-24-90016
DC-24-90017

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge

ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, filed against three 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.

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 (2019), RULE 11(g)(2).


Sri Srinivasan, Chief Judge

Date: July 3, 2024

No. DC-24-90015
No. DC-24-90016
No. DC-24-90017

MEMORANDUM

The complainant has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against three judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. For the following reasons, the misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant filed in the district court a conspiracy complaint against several state agencies and officials outside of the District of Columbia and against at least one individual and two agencies located in the District of Columbia. The district court concluded that venue was improper because most of the defendants resided in the other jurisdiction and because essentially all the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in that other state. The district court ordered that the case be transferred to that state.

The complainant petitioned the court of appeals for a writ of mandamus rescinding the district court's order transferring her case. The complainant alleged a vast conspiracy pursuant to which she has ostensibly been targeted by state officials in her home outside the District of Columbia and at a county courthouse in the state where she resided. The complainant argued that venue was appropriate in the District of Columbia because her allegations were related to domestic terrorism and thus involve a national security risk.

The three subject judges, who comprised the panel of the court of appeals, determined that the district court did not abuse its discretion in transferring this case to the other jurisdiction. The subject judges also denied the complainant's motions which requested, among other things, a judgment of four hundred million dollars, a "no contact order" between

the complainant and the defendants, cease-and-desist orders issued against the defendants, and the reinstatement of the complainant's credit report. The subject judges determined that the complainant had not provided a valid basis for the requested relief.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the three subject judges. The bulk of the complaint alleges wrongdoing by individuals and judges in other jurisdictions. To the extent the complainant alleges wrongdoing on behalf of the subject judges, she asserts that the judges "refus[ed] to investigate . . . a complaint or enforcement of decision" and that a motion "for a set aside Judgment for Fraud upon the court" be granted.

The complaint, however, is directly challenging the merits of the court of appeal's order denying the petition for writ of mandamus. "Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge – without more – is merits-related." JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, Rule 4(b)(1) Commentary ¶ 12. Such an allegation does not constitute "[c]ognizable misconduct" under the Judicial-Conduct Proceedings Rules or the applicable statute. *Id.* Here, the complainant only contends that the order dismissing the petition for writ of mandamus was incorrect.

The complainant also appears to allege that the subject judges failed to call to the Chief Judge's attention "any reliable information reasonably likely to constitute judicial misconduct." She also states that there is "[c]ognizable misconduct of retaliation against complainants for reporting and disclosing judicial misconduct and discrimination." The complainant, however, has failed to provide any support for these allegations other than her own beliefs that misconduct occurred. Accordingly, because the complaint is "based on allegations lacking

sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred,” the complaint will be dismissed. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii).¹

¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(c) and JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 18(a), the complainant may file a petition for review by the Judicial Council of 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 after the date of the dismissal order. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 18(b).