

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

**Complaint No. DC-25-90058
Complaint No. DC-25-90059
Complaint No. DC-25-90060
Complaint No. DC-25-90061
Complaint No. DC-25-90062
Complaint No. DC-25-90063**

Before: Pillard, Circuit Judge¹

ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaints herein, filed against six judges of the United States Court of Appeals District 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).



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.

No. DC-25-90058
No. DC-25-90059
No. DC-25-90060
No. DC-25-90061
No. DC-25-90062
No. DC-25-90062

MEMORANDUM

The complainant has filed a judicial misconduct complaint against six judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Pursuant to the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings (Judicial-Conduct Proceedings Rules), Commentary on Rule 8, ¶ 2, this Circuit processes the complaint with separate docket numbers for each subject judge. For the following reasons, these misconduct complaints will be dismissed.

The complaints are related to two appeals stemming from the complainant's lawsuit. The complainant originally filed the 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. On November 14, 2024, the district court denied the stay. On November 25, 2024, the appellate court also denied the stay.

On July 24, 2025, the district court 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 second appellate case, filed on September 22, 2025, was of the dismissal of her district court case. The six subject judges of these misconduct complaints served on the appellate panels that presided on the complainant's appeals. The complainant has also filed two complaints against the presiding judge of the district court case and one against the circuit chief judge.²

The complainant claimed that the district court clerk's office had transferred a deficient record on appeal, including altered docket sheets, and that the district court was prohibited from dismissing her case while it was on appeal. On September 17, 2025, the appellate court in the complainant's first case, the interlocutory appeal, ordered the complainant to show cause as to why her appeal should not be dismissed following the dismissal of the underlying case. The court specified that her response to the order

² As the complainant has filed nine judicial misconduct complaints since September 2024, arising out of the same set of issues, she is cautioned that filing additional complaints raising the same issues may result in the imposition of restrictions against filing of additional complaints, per the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, Rule 10(a).

should not exceed 5,200 words and further ordered that consideration of all other court filings was deferred pending further order of the court. Between September 17, and October 11, 2025, the complainant then filed 17 documents, including letters, motions, appendices, and petitions, styled as, inter alia, “emergency motion,” “expedited motion to vacate void judgment and compel recusal based on irrefutable fraud upon the court and lack of jurisdiction,” and “petition for extraordinary judicial mandate: summary reversal, vacatur of void judgment, and mandate for permanent injunctive relief.” Complainant did not identify any of her several submissions as a response to the order to show cause.

On October 14, 2025, the court revoked the complainant’s electronic filing rights for the court and instructed the clerk not to accept any further submissions from her in the instant case, pending further order of the court. Similarly, in her second appellate case, the court ordered that the Clerk “not accept from appellant any further submissions in this case, except for a single reply in support of her motions for summary reversal combined with a response to any dispositive motion filed by appellee, pending further order of the court.”

The complainant claims that there has been a “sustained, willful refusal by successive judicial panels of the D.C. Circuit to rule on or investigate documented administrative and emergency motions” that she had filed and that this “non-action constitutes conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts.” The complainant alleges that the appellate court has not docketed all of her filings and has not ruled on several of her motions. This inaction, she claims,

“constitutes a deliberate breach of the duty to ensure the expeditious administration of justice.”

To the extent that the complainant’s claims are motivated by dissatisfaction with rulings made by the subject judges, including about the limitations put on her ability to docket additional filings in her cases, 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 RULE), 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.* To the extent that her complaints against the appellate judges are about delay or “non-action,” “[c]ognizable misconduct does not include an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 4(b)(2).

Furthermore, on her allegations of ex parte communication with the government or 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 complaints are “directly related to the merits of [the judges’] decision” and “lack sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred,” the complaints should be dismissed. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULES 11(c)(1)(B) & (D); see 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (iii).³

³ 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).