

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

In re:
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

*
*
*No. 06-15-90069
*
*
*
*

M E M O R A N D U M

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by a federal prisoner against the district judge who accepted his guilty plea, sentenced him, and subsequently revoked his supervised release. His handwritten complaint is extremely difficult to decipher: it appears that he is complaining about his original conviction, as he attaches what appears to be a list of the evidence used against him, but he makes no discernibly specific allegations. At one point, he refers generally to “butchered transcripts”; at another, he laments that federal judges have turned a “blind eye” to his travails.

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.

Under the most liberal construction possible, the gravamen of the complaint is the complainant’s dissatisfaction with his conviction, sentence, and subsequent revocation of his supervised release. It is therefore subject to dismissal as directly related to the merits of the named judge’s decisions in complainant’s 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 rulings 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