

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

In re:
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

*
*
*No. 06-15-90051
*
*
*
*

M E M O R A N D U M

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by a prisoner against the district judge who was assigned to his habeas corpus proceedings. The crux of the complaint is contained in two attachments to the form submitted by the complainant. The first attachment is a grievance addressed to the state bar, in which the complainant states that the subject judge should be recused from a specific case due to “judicial bias.” The second attachment is a memorandum opinion and order authored by the subject judge and denying the complainant’s motion for reduction of sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c).

After conducting an initial review, the chief judge may dismiss a complaint as to which he concludes: (A) that the claimed conduct, even if it occurred, “is not 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 judicial office”; (B) that the complaint “is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling”; (C) that the complaint is “frivolous,” a term that applies to charges that are wholly unsupported; or (D) that the complaint “lack[s] sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred.” Rule 11(c)(1)(A)-(D), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

While the complainant perfunctorily charges judicial bias, the only evidence of bias proffered is the subject judge’s order denying relief in the underlying criminal case. The complaint is therefore subject to dismissal as directly related to the merits of the named judge’s decisions in complainant’s underlying criminal proceedings 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 the named judge’s rulings or to grant relief requested in the underlying case. See *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 858 F.2d 331 (6th Cir. 1988).

For these reasons, the complaint will be dismissed 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.

/s/ R. Guy Cole, Jr.
Chief Judge

Date: November 10, 2015