JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

In the Matter of
A Complaint of Judicial
Misconduct or Disability

Complaint No. DC-25-90027

Before: Henderson, Circuit Judge[1]

ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, filed against a judge of the United States Court of Appeals 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, RULE11(g)(2).

Karen LeCraft Henderson, Circuit Judge

Date: 8/22/25

[1] Acting pursuant to Rule 25(f) of the RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS.

MEMORANDUM

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

The complainant describes three concerns in her complaint. The first is about the D.C. Courts' policy providing that pro se parties may only be referred to mediation if the judge making the referral appoints an attorney or takes other steps for unrepresented parties to have counsel for mediation.[2] She claims this policy violates the 14th Amendment because "there is no rational basis for the requirement." She concludes that the policy results in the exclusion of "probably 95% or more of non-prisoner pro se litigants" from the program.

The complainant's second claim concerns the court's policies for summary dismissals. In explaining her position, she references litigation in which she was involved "more than a decade ago" and states she is "worried" a new case she is considering filing in the District of Columbia will be summarily dismissed based on misrepresentations of the facts or the law. She notes that "I don't see how the policies of the Court of Appeals will protect me from such misrepresentations."

---

[2] See the "Mediation FAQs" on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit website, www.cadc.uscourts.gov.

The complainant's third concern is that the Court "does not have a rule regarding expedited rulings on habeas corpus." She describes events that took place from 2005-07 on the order of a former judge in another circuit and expresses her fear that she "will be arrested again without probable cause that I committed a federal crime" and her worry that "other people will suffer from arbitrary detention and that habeas relief will not be available to them." As the events described do not involve a judge of the Courts of the D.C. Circuit, they are not appropriately considered here. Allegations of misconduct must be filed "with the circuit clerk in the jurisdiction in which the subject judge holds office," per JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, RULE 7(a)(1).

The Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Rules describe "cognizable misconduct" as that which is "prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts." JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, RULE 4(a). The complainant describes her disagreement and discomfort with several court policies and speculates that certain policies may affect her in a future lawsuit or result in harm to other people. The complainant does not make allegations of misconduct against a judge of the courts of the D.C. Circuit. Rather, she states that the subject judge "is responsible for the mechanisms that allow such perversions." Insofar as the complainant has concerns with the local rules, members of the public have the opportunity to comment on proposed amendments to both the national rules of procedure and the D.C. Circuit's local rules, at: www.uscourts.gov/forms-rules, for national rules and at www.cadc.uscourts.gov, for the

D.C. Circuit. D.C. Circuit Rule 47(b) provides that "[a]ny person may propose a change in these rules by submitting a written suggestion to the court or to its Advisory Committee on Procedures."[3]

The complainant does raise events that occurred in another circuit and relate to a former judge of a court within that circuit. However, she seems to refer to them as an example of why she disagrees with this court's policies, rather than seeking a remedy from this court for those allegations (which, as previously noted, per JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, RULE 7(a)(1), this court could not grant). As the complaint is "based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct occurred" JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, RULE 11(c)(1)(D); 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii), and no cognizable misconduct is alleged, the misconduct complaint will be dismissed.[4]

---

[3] D.C. Cir. R. 47(b).

[4] 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).