

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

Complaint No. DC-24-90049

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: April 23, 2025

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 filed suit in district court alleging that he is an Asian American veteran with a service-connect disability and that a university discriminated against him when he sought a leave of absence from the university's doctoral program. The complainant moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) and for a CM/ECF password to permit electronic filing. The request to proceed IFP was denied without prejudice because the complainant failed to provide the necessary financial information. The complainant then filed an amended motion for leave to proceed IFP, and that motion was granted by a second district court judge. The case was then assigned to that judge. The motion for a CM/ECF password remains pending.

Prior to the district court's order initially denying IFP status, the complainant filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judge. The complainant alleges that his motion for leave to proceed IFP was pending for "an unreasonable duration." The complainant further claims that in another of his cases, the subject judge "fail[ed] to timely adjudicate the motion [for leave to proceed IFP] in that instance" and "significantly impaired the plaintiff's ability to proceed with their case." The complainant also states that in the underlying case associated with this misconduct complaint, the subject judge has "delayed ruling on the plaintiff's motion for electronic

filing.” According to the complainant, “[t]his pattern of delays not only contravenes established legal standards but also represents a failure to uphold the core principles of judicial efficiency and fairness.”

Although the complainant alleges that the subject judge engaged in misconduct, the subject judge was not involved in either of the cases that the complainant references. In the underlying case associated with this misconduct complaint, two other district court judges handled the complainant’s motions, and the case is now pending before one of those judges. In the other case the complainant references, a third district court judge granted the complainant’s motion to proceed IFP and dismissed the complaint without prejudice. Because the subject judge did not handle either of the complainant’s cases, the complainant has failed to provide any evidence of misconduct by that judge.

Accordingly, because the complaint is “based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred,” the complaint will be dismissed. JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY 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 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).