

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

*
*
*No. 06-13-90095
*
*
*
*

M E M O R A N D U M

This complaint was filed with the Judicial Council of the Sixth Circuit pursuant to the Judicial Councils Reform and Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, P.L. 96-458, as amended by the Judicial Improvements Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-203, the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, and the Rules Governing Complaints of Judicial Misconduct adopted by the Judicial Council of the Sixth Circuit.

After conducting an initial review, the chief judge may dismiss a complaint as to which he concludes:

- (1) that the claimed conduct, even if the claim is true, is not “conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts” and does not indicate a mental or physical disability resulting in inability to discharge the duties of office;
- (2) that the complaint is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling;
- (3) that the complaint is frivolous, a term that includes making charges that are wholly unsupported.

Rule 4(c), Rules Governing Complaints of Judicial Misconduct or Disability.

This complaint was filed by a pro se prisoner against a district judge who presided over a civil rights action complainant filed in the district court. In his complaint of judicial misconduct, complainant contends that the named district judge ordered all of the defendants to appear for trial, then conspiring with the state attorney general’s office, dismissed complainant’s action. A limited review of the pertinent district court record reveals, however, that complainant’s civil rights action was tried to the bench. Following trial, the district court made findings of fact, conclusions of law, and entered judgment for the defendants. Complainant did not appeal.

Despite complainant’s contention that his complaint of judicial misconduct is more than merits related, this complaint is subject to dismissal primarily as directly related to the

merits of the named judge's judgment in the underlying case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. Such decisions are not the proper subject of a complaint of judicial misconduct. See Rule 3(h)(3)(A), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. The Judicial Council is not a court and has no jurisdiction to review any rulings by a judge, or to grant the relief that may be requested in the underlying case. See *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 858 F.2d 331 (6th Cir. 1988). Complainant's challenge to the judgment at issue was more appropriately addressed in the context of an appeal. As this complaint primarily and directly relates to the merits of the named judge's ruling in the underlying civil rights action, the complaint will be dismissed in part pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

Otherwise, complainant's assertions that the named judge either conspired against him or was biased against him are devoid of factual support and are inherently incredible. "An allegation may be dismissed as 'inherently incredible' even if it is not literally impossible for the allegation to be true. An allegation is inherently incredible if no reasonable person would believe that the allegation, either on its face or in light of other available evidence, could be true." Implementation of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980: A Report to the Chief Justice, Judicial Conduct and Disability Act Study Committee, Sept. 2006, p. 148. In fact, a review of the available court records tends to refute complainant's assertions of a conspiracy or bias. The complaint therefore will be dismissed in remaining part pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(D) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

For these reasons, the complaint will be dismissed both as directly related to the merits of the named judge's decision and as lacking sufficient evidentiary basis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (iii) and Rules 3(h)(3)(A) and 11(c)(1)(B) & (D) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.



Alice M. Batchelder
Chief Judge

Date: 08-01-14