

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

**Complaint No. DC-25-90037
Complaint No. DC-25-90038**

Before: Henderson, Circuit Judge¹

ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, filed against a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia 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, RULE 11(g)(2).



Karen LeCraft Henderson, Circuit Judge

Date: 9/12/25

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

MEMORANDUM

Complainant has filed complaints against a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. For the following reasons, the complaints will be dismissed. The complainant's allegations of misconduct are unclear. Although labelled as a "Statement of Facts," it is styled as a pleading, in which he is bringing suit against "Satan" and "Roes 1-350". In this "Statement," complainant attempts to give "notice" of a "stipulation agreement between da parties to assign criminal case numbers to both cases removed to da U.S. District Court D.C." Complainant specifies two cases in district court in which he sought to remove several cases from the Superior Court of the District of Columbia to federal court. Both of these cases have been dismissed. The earlier of the cases was the subject of the complaint's previous misconduct complaint, which has also been dismissed. The latter case is currently on appeal.

To the extent that the complainant is alleging any misconduct, he appears to claim that the failure to allow the removal of the cases from the Superior Court to federal court was a deliberate act of judicial misconduct. However, it is unclear what acts of judicial misconduct are claimed. There are no allegations made against the appellate judge. The complainant refers to the district judge as "an underling at the behest of Satan" and having "evil, vicious, heinous, Hamas domestic Terrorism through Malpractice, Malfeasance, and Stupidity" by failing to allow the removal of the Superior Court cases

to federal court. The complainant asserts that the decision not to remove the cases was that of the subject district judge, although that judge did not issue the decision in the case, nor does it appear that judge was ever assigned to the case. The complainant goes on to state that “Impeachment proceedings shall commence against” that judge and claims that his document is a stipulation agreement by which the cases from Superior Court will be removed to federal court.

Complainant’s allegations of misconduct are vague and unsupported and are therefore “lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred.” JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, RULE 11(c)(1)(D). To the extent that the complainant is challenging the decision to not to accept the removal of a case, the complaint is directly challenging the merits of a judicial decision. “Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge – without more – is merits-related.” *Id.* 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 and therefore should be dismissed. *Id.* RULE 11(c)(1)(b); see 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii).

Accordingly, because the complaints are “directly related to the merits of [the judge’s] decision” and “lack[s] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred,” the complaints will be dismissed. JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, RULES 11(c)(1)(B) & (D); see 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (iii).