

JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

**Complaint No. DC-25-90001**

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: May 7, 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, this misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant sued her criminal defense attorney, a government agency, employees of a district court in another state, and a United States magistrate judge (collectively federal defendants) alleging violations of her civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The complainant filed a motion for a preliminary injunction, which the subject judge denied. The defense attorney then filed a motion to dismiss, and the judge directed the complainant to respond to the motion or risk dismissal. The complainant filed a motion for a CM/ECF password, which the judge dismissed without prejudice because the complainant had failed to satisfy the district court rules for seeking a CM/ECF password. The complainant then filed a flurry of motions, including an amended motion for CM/ECF password, a motion for sanctions, and motions to take judicial notice.

The subject judge granted the defense attorney's motion to dismiss and denied as moot the complainant's pending motions. The judge concluded that the complainant's defense attorney was not subject to claims under § 1983. The judge additionally dismissed the complaint against the federal defendants for want of jurisdiction. The complainant then sought reconsideration of the dismissal order, arguing that she had never been served with the motion to dismiss. The judge denied reconsideration, explaining that, while the complainant had not been served with the motion, "lack of notice of a dispositive motion' is not a sufficient ground for granting reconsideration." The complainant then filed a supplemental memorandum concerning the motion for reconsideration and a motion for order of service, which the subject judge denied.

The judge later dismissed a number of other motions filed by the complainant because the case was by then closed.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judge. The complainant alleges that the judge was improperly “handpicked” to handle her case and that he wrongfully dismissed her complaint when she had not been served with the motion to dismiss. The complainant further claims that the judge failed to rule on her motions for a CM/ECF password, improperly denied her motion for sanctions, and decided her motion for reconsideration without allowing for the filing of her supplement. She also asserts that the judge “deliberately misstated facts and records on the face of his order granting [the defense attorney’s] motion” for dismissal.

To the extent the complainant alleges that the subject judge improperly granted the motion to dismiss, misstated facts in the dismissal order, failed to rule on her CM/ECF motions, and improperly denied her motion for sanctions and for reconsideration, those allegations are a direct challenge to the merits of the judge’s orders. “Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge – without more – is merits-related.” JUDICIAL-CONDUCT 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.* Moreover, contrary to the complainant’s assertion, the judge had ruled on both of the complainant’s motions for a CM/ECF password.

To the extent the complainant alleges that the subject judge was somehow improperly assigned to handle her case, the complainant has failed to provide any evidence demonstrating that the judge had any role in the assignment of her case. The fact that the judge was assigned to several of her cases is not itself evidence of misconduct. *See* Local District Court Rule 40.5(c)

Assignment of Related Cases. The complainant's allegation related to the assignment of her case thus "lack[s] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." 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 a decision" 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 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).