

JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

**Complaint No. DC-25-90026**

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge

**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 (2019), RULE 11(g)(2).

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sri Srinivasan, Chief Judge

Date: April 24, 2026

**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, the misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant filed a complaint alleging “violations of fundamental rights committed by the defendants under color of law” under various federal statutes and constitutional provisions. After the complainant filed an affidavit of service, the Clerk of Court entered a default against several of the defendants. Those defendants moved to set aside the default on the ground that they had not been properly served. The complainant then filed an amended complaint. Because the amended complaint superseded the original complaint, the subject judge vacated the Clerk’s entry of default and directed the complainant to effect service of the amended complaint on all defendants. The complainant did not file proof of service but instead filed a motion to voluntarily dismiss, in which he acknowledged that he had not served the amended complaint and that dismissal was appropriate. Because the complainant admitted he had not served the defendants, the subject judge granted his motion to dismiss without prejudice. In light of the dismissal, the subject judge denied as moot all of the complainant’s pending motions.

Despite having voluntarily moved to dismiss his case, the complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judge, alleging that the judge improperly handled his underlying case in a variety of ways. In addition, the complainant

asserts that the fact that the defendants filed only two documents—a notice of appearance and a motion to set aside the default judgment—is evidence that the subject judge “created an appearance of bias.” He further alleges that the subject judge “used procedural roadblocks and intentional delays to wear down and harm [him], amounting to a deliberate denial of justice.”

The complainant has also filed a request to transfer his judicial misconduct complaint to another circuit, alleging that “[g]iven the unjustified delay, inaction, and apparent disregard for the seriousness of the misconduct and my rights as a complainant, the involvement of the D.C. Circuit in this matter raises legitimate concerns of institutional bias, conflict of interest, or unwillingness to ensure judicial accountability.”

The majority of the complainant’s allegations are direct challenges to the merits of the subject judge’s decisions in the underlying case. The complainant specifically alleges that the subject judge improperly: vacated the Clerk’s entry of default; accepted the amended complaint without a motion to leave; failed to reset the procedural times after filing his amended complaint; placed in abeyance and then denied as moot his motion to appoint an expert witness; and denied his motion for recusal. “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. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY 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.*

With respect to the complainant's contention that the subject judge was biased against him, generalized allegations of misconduct "lack[] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); *see* U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii). The fact that the defendants in the case filed only two pleadings before the complaint's dismissal (at the complainant's own request) does not support an allegation of judicial misconduct.

With respect to the complainant's allegation that the subject judge delayed ruling in the underlying case, "[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). The complainant has not identified delay in a "significant number of unrelated cases," and insofar as he alleges that the subject judge's delays were the result of an improper motive, the complainant only states generally that her decisions were to "wear down and harm [him]." Thus, the complainant's generalized delay allegations "lack[] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." *See* JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii).

Finally, the complainant's request to seek a transfer of his misconduct complaint to another circuit will be denied as there is no sound basis for the request.

Accordingly, because the complaint "is directly related to the merits of [the judge's] decision[s]," 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 of 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).