

JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

**Complaint No. DC-25-90036**

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, the misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant filed a pro se action against the United States and officers of the Veterans Appeals Board in their official capacity (collectively United States) and employees of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (VFW) pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act. The complainant challenged the Veterans Administration's failure to provide him with certain veterans' benefits related to a medical reimbursement appeal. The defendants moved to dismiss the complainant's amended complaint. The subject judge granted the motions to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, determining that 38 U.S.C. § 511(a) precludes federal district courts from reviewing Veterans Administration decisions on veterans' benefits. The subject judge noted that exclusive jurisdiction to redress veterans' benefits determinations resides with the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims and from there the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

The complainant noted an appeal of the dismissal order. The Court of Appeals granted the United States' motion for summary affirmance, denied the complainant's motion for summary reversal, and directed the Clerk to enter a briefing schedule for the

complainant's claims against the VFW. The complainant sought en banc review of the order granting summary affirmance, which was denied. The Court of Appeals subsequently affirmed the subject judge's order dismissing the case as it related to the claims against the VFW appellees. The complainant then sought en banc review of that decision, which was denied.

The complainant has now filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against the subject judge arguing that the judge "discriminated against a black military veteran and ignored her duty to protect the U.S. Constitution thereby creating distrust regarding the impartiality of the D.C. Circuit Courts." The complainant further noted that when he attempted to pursue his rights in district court, the subject judge

claimed that the court lacked jurisdiction due to the preclusion provisions of the VJRA, particularly section 511(a) which prohibits courts from second-guessing determinations made by the VA. . . . [T]here has been no determination regarding [the complainant's] appeal and therefore the court should not have adhered to the preclusion provisions of the VJRA. . . . The fact [that the subject judge] ignored [the complainant's] evidence of constitutional violations and then applied section 511(a) where the facts clearly demonstrated that the statute was not applicable, indicates that this judge believes that she had a duty to protect the VA from liability for its illegal and discriminatory actions.

The complainant's allegations are direct challenges to the merits of the subject judge's dismissal order. "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.* In addition, the complainant’s own unsubstantiated assertion that the subject judge’s decision was racially motivated “lack[s] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred.” *See* JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii). Accordingly, the complaint will be dismissed. *See* JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(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).