

JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

In the Matter of  
A Complaint of Judicial  
Misconduct or Disability

Complaint No. DC-24-90018

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge

**ORDER**

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, filed against a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 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 judge, 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

**MEMORANDUM**

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

The complainant, proceeding pro se, filed suit against several agencies of a city outside of the District of Columbia, a state police department, two federal agencies, and a company, seeking to recover \$1.5 trillion in compensatory damages and \$3 trillion in punitive damages for the harm she and her family suffered as a result of an event from almost thirty years ago. The subject judge dismissed the claims against the police, the city, and the federal agencies based on sovereign immunity, lack of personal jurisdiction, and lapse of the statute of limitations. The judge also set aside the entry of default against the company, as it had never been properly served and thus had no obligation to respond to the complaint. The judge then filed the company's motion to dismiss and directed the complainant to respond. Finally, the judge denied as moot the complainant's motions for declaratory judgment and default judgment.

The complainant then sought a preliminary injunction seeking to "prohibit[] the Honorable Judge [] . . . from this case" and to bar the "[city] from entering into any form or business deal" with certain companies. The motion also appeared to seek reconsideration of the dismissal order. The subject judge denied the motion for a preliminary injunction, finding that the complainant had failed to demonstrate that she was likely to succeed on the merits. To the extent the complainant was seeking reconsideration of the dismissal order, the judge denied that request. And finally, because the complainant failed to respond to the company's

motion to dismiss and the claims against the company were time barred, the subject judge granted the company's motion to dismiss. The judge then directed the Clerk of Court to terminate the case.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judge. The complainant alleges that the judge "violated the doctrine of Stare Decisis and enforce[d] a conflict of law" and that the dismissal orders "insult[] the law . . . [and are] out of accord with authority." The complainant also asserts that the judge "denies me the right to sue in federal court."

The complaint directly challenges the merits of the subject judge's orders dismissing the complaint. "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 argues that the orders dismissing the complaint were incorrect. 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).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).