

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

Complaint No. DC-25-90033

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge

ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, and the supplement thereto, 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: July 15, 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 Freedom of Information Act complaint against fourteen government entities. The case was assigned to the subject judge. The complainant then filed a flurry of motions, including a motion for a temporary restraining order, a motion for interim emergency relief, a motion for status update, a motion for recusal, and a motion requesting the U.S. Marshals Service to serve his complaint on the defendants.

The complainant then filed his first judicial misconduct complaint, alleging that the subject judge had refused to respond to certain of his motions. By the time of the filing of the misconduct complaint, the subject judge had denied several of the complainant's motions. The complainant then filed another series of motions and notices, including multiple motions for a temporary restraining order, which were denied. The complainant also moved to recuse the subject judge, which the subject judge denied. The government ultimately filed a motion to dismiss. Meanwhile, the complainant filed a second judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judge, again alleging that the judge continued to delay ruling on his motions.

The subject judge subsequently granted the motion to dismiss in part and denied it in part. As a result of the government shutdown, the subject judge extended the period of time for the government to answer the remaining claims and to file a dispositive motion or a report that informs the court of the status of each remaining FOIA request and a schedule for completion of the production of documents.

This court denied the previous two misconduct complaints, determining that the complainant had not identified delay in a “significant number of unrelated cases,” and in the first complaint had not alleged that the delays were the result of an improper motive. Moreover, the subject judge ruled on the motions at issue within weeks. With respect to the complainant’s second misconduct complaint, this court again determined that the complainant had failed to identify delay in a “significant number of unrelated cases.” In addition, the complainant’s unsubstantiated allegations were not evidence of an improper motive. This court also determined that the complainant’s challenge to the subject judge’s denial of his recusal motion was merits-related and “lack[ed] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred.” *See In the Matter of A Complaint of Judicial Misconduct or Disability*, No. DC-24-90029 and 24-90048 (March 12, 2025).

The complaint now before the court once again alleges that the subject judge is delaying consideration of pending motions—specifically, the government’s motion to dismiss. As previously noted, however, “[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.” JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS (2019), Rule 4(b)(2). The complainant once again has not identified delay in a “significant number of unrelated cases,” and he does not claim that the alleged delay was the result of an improper motive. Also, at the time the complainant filed this third misconduct complaint, the complainant had filed at least fifteen additional pleadings that the subject judge needed to address. The subject judge has now ruled on the dismissal motion, granting it in part and denying it in part, and did so without undue delay. While the subject judge extended the deadline for the

defendants to either file a dispositive motion on the remaining claims or a report informing the court of the status of the each surviving 123 remaining FOIA requests, that delay was a result of the government shutdown. Thus, as was the case with the complainant's first two misconduct complaints, the current allegations again "lack[] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred," and this complaint will be dismissed. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii).¹

¹ 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).