

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

In re:
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

*
*
*No. 06-14-90091
*
*
*
*

M E M O R A N D U M

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by a pro se prisoner against the district judge who dismissed his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The gravamen of his complaint is that the subject judge misidentified him as the plaintiff in a previous civil action which, the judge noted in his final order, would count as a “strike” for 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) purposes should the complainant file another, future civil action. The complainant contends that this error forced him to file an appeal, which he should not have had to pay for. He asks that his assessment for the appellate filing fees be stopped and that any fees already paid be credited to his assessment for the district court filing fees.

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.

The complaint is subject to dismissal as directly related to the merits of the named judge’s decisions in the underlying 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). In any event, the subject judge corrected the error when he granted complainant’s Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) motion.

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 26, 2014