

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

Complaint No. DC-25-90051

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 ten defendants, including various government agencies and officials. The subject judge sua sponte dismissed the complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, concluding that the complainant “may not simply repeat claims that a previous court has already found defective without facing dismissal on the basis of issue preclusion.”

The complainant has now filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against the subject judge. The complaint, which is identical to the complainant’s earlier complaint filed against a different subject judge (*see* DC-25-90040), reads in its entirety as follows:

I allege that [the subject judge] has engaged in Judicial misconduct which includes but may not be limited too [sic] the following: 1) Engaging in quid pro quo arrangements with Defendant(s) 2) Taking Judicial action(s) with the intent to harm the Plaintiff 3) Abstaining from taking Judicial action(s) in effort to harm the Plaintiff 4) Leveraging the illegal communication mechanism(s) highlighted in the Plaintiff’s complaint against the Defendant(s) 5) The intentional failure to uphold the virtues and rights for citizens to receive a fair and impartial hearing.

As with the complainant’s related complaint in DC-25-90040, to the extent the complainant is challenging the dismissal of his complaint, this claim is without merit.

“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.* To the extent the complainant is alleging judicial misconduct beyond his disagreement with the merits of the subject judge’s decision, like in DC-25-90040, the complainant has failed to provide any evidence of misconduct. Accordingly, because the complaint is “based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred,” this complaint will also be dismissed. *See* JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(D); *see* 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 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).