

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

Complaint No. DC-25-90050

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 17, 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.¹ For the following reasons, the misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant mentioned a public official in a tweet about purported corruption at her agency, and the official blocked the complainant from her Twitter account. The complainant then brought the instant pro se lawsuit asserting that the public official's Twitter account is a public forum used to share her agency's information and that, when the official blocked him, she violated his First Amendment rights. The subject judge stayed the litigation pending the Supreme Court's issuance of its decisions in two relevant cases. Eight months later, after the Supreme Court handed down its decisions, the subject judge dismissed the complainant's action. The subject judge concluded that, "[w]hen evaluated in light of the Supreme Court's recent guidance, [the complainant's] complaint and other pleadings do not plausibly allege that [the public official] purported to use her authority to speak for the [agency] when operating her Twitter account. Blocking [the complainant] from the account therefore did not violate the First Amendment." The complainant noted an appeal, but the appeal was ultimately dismissed

¹ The complainant requests that the Chief District Court Judge not consider his complaint and that it be "reassigned." Complaints of judicial misconduct, however, are considered by the Chief Circuit Judge. *See* JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, Rule 3(a) ("'Chief Judge' means the chief judge of the United States court of appeals").

for failure to prosecute.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judge for his handling of the complainant's case. First, the complainant alleges that the subject judge's reference in his dismissal opinion to the interaction between the complainant and the official as a "skirmish" and the litigation as a "long-running campaign" "signals an immediate appearance of judicial bias that undermines confidence in judicial impartiality." The complainant adds that a typographical error misspelling complainant's name in the memorandum opinion, "[c]ombined with the dismissive tone of the opinion, . . . undermines confidence in the impartiality and thoroughness of the judicial process." Second, the complainant asserts that the subject judge "failed to conduct a detailed analysis of the two-prong test outlined by the U.S. Supreme Court", "ignored evidence", and failed to address the agency's legal status. Finally, the complainant argues that the length of time between the Supreme Court's decisions and the subject judge's decision "undermines the constitutional imperative of timely redress and further erodes confidence in the impartial administration of justice."

To the extent the complainant is challenging the language the subject judge used in his memorandum opinion, that allegation is without merit. The Judicial Conference has explained that, "[b]ecause of the special need to protect judges' independence in deciding what to say in an opinion or ruling," if a judge's "language was relevant to the case at hand – for example, a statement that a claim is legally or factually 'frivolous' – then the judge's choice of language is presumptively merits-related and excluded, absent

evidence apart from the ruling itself suggesting an improper motive.” JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, Rule 4 Commentary at ¶ 15. Here, the complainant has failed to provide any evidence suggesting an improper motive, other than his own belief that the subject judge’s word choice demonstrates bias. The fact that there was a typographical error in the spelling of the complainant’s name in the opinion does not, without more, support an allegation of misconduct. This allegation thus is “directly related to the merits” of the dismissal order and does not constitute “cognizable misconduct.” JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 4(b)(1).

To the extent the complainant is asserting that the subject judge failed to follow Supreme Court precedent, ignored evidence, and failed to address certain issues, those allegations must also be dismissed. “Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge – without more – is merits-related.” JUDICIAL-CONDUCT 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.* The complainant also does not provide any support for his allegations against the subject judge other than his own beliefs that the Canons of the Code of Conduct were violated. The allegations thus “lack[] 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).

Finally, with respect to the complainant’s allegation that the subject judge improperly delayed resolution of the case after the Supreme Court issued its relevant

decisions, “[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 does not allege that the delay was the result of an improper motive. The allegation of delay therefore “lack[s] 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).

Accordingly, because the complaint raises allegations that are “directly related to the merits” and “lack[] 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).²

² 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).