

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

Complaint No. DC-25-90039

Before: Pillard, Circuit Judge¹

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, RULE 11(g)(2).



Cornelia T. L. Pillard, Circuit Judge

Date: January 9, 2026

¹ Acting pursuant to Rule 25(f) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

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 filed a lawsuit in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims on May 3, 2024. On July 2, 2024, the United States filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), because the Court of Federal Claims lacks jurisdiction on claims made under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA). On the complainant's unopposed motion to transfer, the Court of Federal Claims transferred the case to the DC District Court. The Court of Federal Claims' order transferring the case also dismissed as moot the government's motion to dismiss.

In her lawsuit, the complainant alleges that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was negligent in its failure to properly investigate crimes and conspiracies that she reported, which included theft, sexual assault, and RICO violations. She made several motions for injunctive relief that were denied. On October 31, 2024, the complainant appealed the court's denial of her injunctive relief motions and sought to stay the district court case pending resolution of the appeal. The stay was denied.

On July 24, 2025, the subject judge dismissed the complaint, granting the government's motion to dismiss. The court found it did not have subject matter

jurisdiction because the complainant's allegations were within the FTCA's discretionary exception.

The complainant's misconduct complaint against the subject judge stems from her claim that the dismissal of her lawsuit on July 24, 2025, was made without notice to her and while her case was on appeal. She further claims that the Court of Federal Claims had "previously ruled on the issue of subject matter jurisdiction in a prior proceeding, finding that jurisdiction existed." The complainant also repeats claims made in her earlier (since dismissed) complaint against the subject judge (DC-24-90035), including that the court engaged in ex parte communications; denied her injunctive relief motion in the absence of a response from the government; failed to schedule hearings on her motions; and took actions "outsider the proper procedural channels."

The complainant contends that her misconduct complaint is "unrelated to the merits of the underlying case" and requests a "review of the circumstances" of the dismissal of her case and her concerns of ex parte communications. She asserts that the subject judge's "actions constitute judicial misconduct by acting beyond the scope of retained jurisdiction and by interfering with the appellate process." And she claims that the subject judge's dismissal of her lawsuit while her appeal for preliminary injunctive relief was pending was a "usurpation of the appellate court's jurisdiction." However, as noted above, the district court denied her motion for a stay pending appeal and the court of appeals had also denied her emergency motion for a stay.

The complainant further claims the court engaged in ex parte communication and procedural irregularities. Those allegations were also made in her previous complaint

against the subject judge, and the complainant has failed to provide any evidence of judicial misconduct other than her own unsupported beliefs.

To the extent that the complainant's complaints are motivated by dissatisfaction with rulings made by the subject judge, including about the refusal to stay her case, her allegations are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling" and thus are not proper grounds for a finding of judicial misconduct. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS (JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULES), RULE 11(c)(1)(B). "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 allegations do not constitute "[c]ognizable misconduct" under the Judicial-Conduct Proceedings Rules or the applicable statute. *Id.*

Furthermore, on her allegations of ex-parte communication with the government and clerks' office interference, the complainant has failed to provide any evidence of judicial misconduct apart from her own unsupported beliefs. Thus, her allegations "lack [] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); 28 U.S.C. 352(b)(1)(A)(iii).

Accordingly, because the complaint is "directly related to the merits of [the judge's] decision" and "lack[s] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct

has occurred,” the complaint should be dismissed. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS
RULES 11(c)(1)(B) & (D); see 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (iii).²

² 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 of the date of the dismissal order, per Judicial-Conduct Proceedings Rule 18(b).