

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

In re:  
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

\*  
\*  
\*No. 06-13-90135  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

**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 denied his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. In his complaint of judicial misconduct, complainant contends that the named district judge denied his petition to cover up criminal acts committed during his criminal proceedings.

This complaint of judicial misconduct is subject to dismissal in part as directly related to the merits of the named judge’s rulings in complainant’s underlying habeas corpus action 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 relief requested in any underlying case. See *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 858 F.2d 331 (6th Cir. 1988). It is noted that complainant did not appeal the named judge's decision in his case.

In remaining part, this complaint is subject to dismissal as insufficiently supported by credible facts to warrant an investigation by a special committee appointed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 353. "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. A review of the pertinent court records reflects that complainant's conclusory assertion that the named judge denied his habeas corpus petition to conceal criminal behavior is devoid of factual support and is inherently incredible. Under these circumstances, 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.

Accordingly, this complaint will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (iii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) & (D) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.



Alice M. Batchelder  
Chief Judge

Date: 08-01-14