

JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**In the Matter of  
A Complaint of Judicial  
Misconduct or Disability**

**Complaint Nos. DC-24-90024  
DC-24-90025  
DC-24-90026**

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: March 7, 2025

No. DC-24-90024  
No. DC-24-90025  
No. DC-24-90026

## **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 an action in district court against three government agencies. She asserted that the defendants discriminated against her by not hiring her for 200 positions, and she requested that the defendants be criminally prosecuted. The complaint was inadvertently docketed as two separate cases. In both cases, the district court dismissed the complaint, including on the ground that the complainant failed to state a discrimination claim.

On appeal, the complainant moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and filed identical briefs that reiterated her allegations of employment discrimination. The court of appeals' panel, made up of the three subject judges, issued an order advising the complainant that the court was disposing of the appeal without oral argument under Circuit Rule 34(j). Before the judgments issued, the complainant filed a motion to reconsider the Rule 34(j) order in each case. The panel denied the motions for reconsideration and subsequently issued a judgment affirming the district court. The complainant filed a petition for rehearing, which was denied. The complainant then filed

a motion to stay the mandate. That motion was also denied, and the subject judges directed the Clerk to accept no further filings from the complainant in the closed case.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judges alleging that “[t]he referenced judges miscarry justice, fail to implement law (F.R.C.P. Rule 12, 55 and F. App. R.P. Rule 31 etc. all other laws under Table of Authorities), misapply law such as Rule 8(a), Rule 40, Rule 41, Fed. R. App. Rule 34; fail to correct errors, has severe bias and discrimination toward appellant, retaliation, abuse, vandalism, negligence etc.”

As to the claims that the subject judges committed a miscarriage of justice, failed to implement the law, misapplied the law, or failed to correct errors, those allegations are direct challenges to the merits of the judges’ orders. “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. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 4(b)(1) Commentary ¶ 12; *see id.* 11(c)(1)(B); 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii). Such an allegation does not constitute “[c]ognizable misconduct” under the Judicial-Conduct Proceedings Rules or the applicable statute. *Id.* These allegations thus must be dismissed as “directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling.” JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(B); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii).

As to the allegations that the subject judges demonstrated bias in their treatment of the complainant, acted in a discriminatory or negligent manner, or otherwise retaliated,

abused, or “vandalized” the complainant, the complainant has failed to provide any evidence indicating that judicial misconduct has occurred. These allegations therefore “lack[] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred,” and must also be dismissed. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii).

Accordingly, because the complaint is “directly related to the merits of [the subject judges’] decision[s]” and 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)(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 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 of the D.C. Circuit within 42 days after the date of the dismissal order. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 18(b).