

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

**Complaint Nos. DC-24-90043
DC-24-90044
DC-24-90045
DC-24-90046
DC-24-90050**

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge

ORDER

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

ORDERED that the complaints 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: April 2, 2025

No. DC-24-90043
No. DC-24-90044
No. DC-24-90045
No. DC-24-90046
No. DC-24-90050

MEMORANDUM

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

The complaint filed suit against two government agencies, the Attorney General of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Vice President of the United States, invoking the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act. The subject district court judge sua sponte dismissed the case without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), concluding that the complaint failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). The judge noted that the complainant alleged no facts establishing that he submitted a request under either the Freedom of Information Act or the Privacy Act or that any requests were denied. The complainant timely appealed. A panel of the court of appeals, consisting of the three subject appellate judges, denied the complainant's motion for appointment of counsel and affirmed the district court's order dismissing the complaint.

The complainant has now filed three separate judicial misconduct complaints. Two are against the subject district court judge (Nos. DC-24-90043 and DC-24-90050)

and one is against the three subject appellate judges (Nos. DC-24-90044 through 90046). The complainant alleges that all four of the subject judges acted with “criminal negligence,” showed signs of “old age and senility,” and engaged in “racial profiling.” The complainant also alleges that he has presented “insurmountable evidence” as to the validity of his underlying complaint.

To the extent the complainant challenges the subject district judge’s dismissal of his complaint or the subject appellate judges’ affirmance of the dismissal order, those allegations appear to be direct challenges to the merits of the judges’ orders dismissing the complaint and affirming the dismissal order. “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.*

With respect to the complainant’s allegation, without elaboration, that all of the subject judges “exhibit[ed] signs of old age,” engaged in “racial profiling,” or acted with “criminal negligence,” those generalized allegations of misconduct “lack[] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred.” *See* JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii). The complainant has failed to provide any evidence of wrongdoing apart from his own unsupported beliefs.

Accordingly, because the complaints are “directly related to the merits of [the

judges'] decision[s]" and are "based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred," the complaints will be dismissed. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(B) & (D); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (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 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 after the date of the dismissal order. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 18(b).