

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

In re:
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

*
*
*No. 06-17-90008
*
*
*
*
*

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by **[REDACTED]** (“complainant”) against the Honorable **[REDACTED]** (“subject judge”), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 351. Citing the subject judge’s opinions and orders in two of his civil-rights actions, the complainant alleges that the subject judge misstated the facts and misapplied the law in a “dishonest and corrupt” effort to assist and protect the defendants in those actions.

After conducting an initial review, the chief judge may dismiss a misconduct 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”; (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; see 28 U.S.C. § 352(a), (b).

An initial review of the record reveals that the subject judge was assigned to a civil-rights action that the complainant filed in 2014. The subject judge denied the complainant’s motion for a preliminary injunction, dismissed the claims against several defendants, and directed service of the complaint on the remaining defendants. The judge later dismissed the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute. The complainant filed a new action in 2016, and the subject judge dismissed it for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.

To the extent that this judicial-misconduct complaint alleges that the subject judge erred in his factual determinations and legal rulings, it is subject to dismissal under Rule 11(c)(1)(B). See *also* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii). Any challenge to the merits of a judge’s rulings is outside the scope of judicial-misconduct proceedings. 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 decision by a judge. See *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 858 F.2d 331, 331-32 (6th Cir. 1988).

To the extent that it alleges dishonesty, corruption, hostility, bias, and “abuse of judicial authority,” the complaint is subject to dismissal under Rule 11(c)(1)(C) as wholly unsupported by the record. See *also* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii). The subject judge’s rulings are the only proffered basis for these allegations.

For these reasons, it is **ORDERED** that the complaint be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (iii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(B) & (C) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

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

Date: August 4, 2017