

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

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

Complaint No. DC-25-90052

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

The complainant sued an attorney and a government official, alleging that they ignored her claims that a musician was stalking her. The district court sua sponte dismissed the complaint for lack of jurisdiction on the ground that it was “patently insubstantial” and presented “no federal question suitable for decision.” The complainant then noted an appeal of the dismissal order. The complainant also simultaneously filed a “request for leave to file review”, which was dismissed by a second district court judge who noted that the case was on appeal, thus depriving the district court of jurisdiction. The complainant then filed a second “request for leave to review”, which the subject judge denied leave to file, noting that the case was closed. The court of appeals subsequently affirmed the district court’s dismissal order, concluding that “[t]he district court correctly concluded that appellant’s claims were so patently insubstantial as to deprive the court of subject-matter jurisdiction.”

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject judge. The only allegation referring to a judge states as follows:

This judge never called me crazy delusional or my case frivolous if I can recall but I was mislead [sic]. I was told that I had to Aug 14 to get my evidence in and they dismissed the case anyway.

The complainant appears to be challenging the dismissal of her case in the district court. “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.* Here, a different district court judge, not the subject judge, dismissed the complaint. Moreover, the complainant fail to provide any evidence that any action by the subject judge was the result of judicial misconduct. Thus, the allegation “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).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).