

JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

**Complaint No. DC-25-90016  
DC-25-90017  
DC-25-90018**

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge

**ORDER**

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, filed against three judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, 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 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 (2019), RULE 11(g)(2).

  
Sri Srinivasan, Chief Judge

Date: February 27, 2026

No. DC-25-90016  
No. DC-25-90017  
No. DC-25-90018

## **MEMORANDUM**

The complainant has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against three judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. For the following reasons, this misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant brought an action against the Environmental Protection Agency Administrator. He alleged violations of a raft of laws and standards, including the Clean Air Act, the Global Climate Protection Act, the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act, the Hatch Act, certain D.C. municipal regulations, agency guidance documents, and the executive employee oath of allegiance.

The district court dismissed the complainant's first amended complaint for failing to provide a "short and plain statement" of his claims and for failing to allege facts establishing Article III standing. The court then dismissed the complainant's second and third amended complaints for much the same reasons. The court subsequently gave the complainant one "final opportunity" to file a complaint that would remedy the identified deficiencies. The complainant did not file an amended complaint and instead filed a motion for summary judgment. The district court denied the motion as moot, noting that because the complaint had been dismissed, the complainant had no claims pending before the court.

The complainant appealed, and he filed a document that was docketed as a motion for summary reversal. The government opposed the complainant's motion and cross-moved for summary affirmance. Upon confirmation of the current Administrator of the EPA, the court of appeals' docket was updated to replace the former Administrator with the current

Administrator. The complainant thereafter filed a motion to add parties, in which he sought to add the former Administrator as a defendant-appellee and add two additional defendants-appellees and one additional plaintiff-appellant.

The court of appeals, made up of the three subject judges, denied the motion to add parties and granted the government's motion for summary affirmance, noting that the district court correctly concluded that the complainant's complaint failed to allege sufficient facts to establish an injury in fact for Article III standing purposes. The court thus determined that it need not reach the district court's determination that dismissal was also warranted based on the complainant's failure to comply with the pleading rules. The complainant's motion to stay the mandate and his petition for rehearing were denied and his motion to correct the docket and expedite the case was dismissed as moot.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the three court of appeals judges who decided his appeal. The complainant alleges that the subject judges were "unintentionally/carelessly exhibiting transparent partisan political bias and unintentionally/carelessly acting unethically by aiding and abetting Obama and Biden era EPA Administrators and DOJ and the current Trump EPA Administrator and DOJ in weaponizing this Court's June 2012 ruling on greenhouse gases." The complainant then details nine "accusations of incorrect actions by this Court":

Accusation 1: It was improper for the Court to refuse to docket and consider [the complainant's] 20-page motion. . . .

Accusation 2: It was improper for the Court to refuse to grant leave to [the complainant] to file documents via email. . . .

Accusation 3: The issues [the complainant] has raised . . . are being arbitrar[ily] and capriciously dismissed. . . .

Accusation 4: [The complainant] is providing definitive evidence in his pleadings that this Court ruled incorrectly in its June 2012 ruling. . . .

Accusation 5: [The complainant] contends that this Court has a legal

ethical obligation to correct the June 2012 ruling. . . .

Accusation 6: This Court has evidence in its hands [that the regulation of greenhouse gases is] grossly invalid and is turning a blind eye to it. . . .

Accusation 7: This Court has evidence in its hands [that requires it] . . . to rule in favor of [the complainant]. . . .

Accusation 8: In twice denying [the complainant] standing, this Court has been failing to take into proper consideration [facts]. . . .

Accusation 9: . . . [I]n ruling incorrectly that [the complainant] lacks standing, this Court is failing to take into consideration [many] factors. . . .

To the extent the complainant’s “accusations” allege that the subject judges erred in affirming the district court’s dismissal, those allegations are a direct challenge to the merits of the judges’ decision. “Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge – without more – is merits-related.” JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY 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.*

To the extent the complainant is alleging that the judges’ decision resulted from bias, that allegation “lacks 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). The complainant has failed to provide any evidence of bias or impartiality other than his own unsubstantiated beliefs.

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).