

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

Complaint No. DC-25-90034

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: 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, this misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant filed a pro se complaint alleging wrongdoing by the President and Vice President of the United States, certain of the President's advisors and Cabinet Secretaries, and other individuals affiliated with the President. The complainant subsequently filed a motion to proceed under a pseudonym, which was granted subject to any further consideration by the district court judge to whom the case was assigned. On July 7, 2025, the subject judge issued a memorandum and opinion dismissing the complaint without prejudice, determining that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint alleging that the subject judge "at the behest of Donald Trump and codefendants intercepted the cases before obtaining jurisdiction as either the 'motions judge' or the 'assigned judge.'" The complainant further asserts that the subject judge "interfered with the judge assigned as motions judge to prevent assignment to an impartial adjudicator and thus entered an order wholly inconsistent with the pleadings, held his orders until 07/07/25, the date upon which he was assigned as 'motions judge.'" As evidence of wrongdoing, the complainant alleges that the subject judge's memorandum dismissing his complaint was dated June 18, 2025, but he did not become the motions judge until July.

The complainant is correct that the subject judge did not become the motions judge until July and the memorandum accompanying the order dismissing the complaint bears the date, June

18, 2025. That fact alone, however, is not evidence of judicial misconduct. Court staff assist every motions judge in preparing draft memoranda and orders and work on all pro se cases regardless of whom the assigned motions judge might be at any given time. Here, the subject judge's dismissal order noted an issuance date of July 7, 2025, which was after he had become the motions judge on July 1, 2025. The June 18, 2025, date on the memorandum appears to be a typographical error, perhaps the date that court staff might have initially drafted the memorandum. The docket reflects that both the order and memorandum issued on July 7, 2025, six days after the subject judge became the motions judge. The different date reflected on the memorandum itself, without more, is "[in]sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." *See* JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, Rule 11(c)(1)(D); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii).

Accordingly, because the complaint 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).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).