

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

In re:
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

*
*
*No. 06-18-90005
*
*
*
*

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by **[REACTED]** (“complainant”) against the Honorable **[REACTED]** (“subject judge”), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 351. The complaint is largely incoherent, weaving a fanciful tale of celebrities, sex trafficking, and money woes. As best can be gleaned from the initial complaint and subsequent correspondence, the complainant alleges that the subject judge is “sitting on” his underlying case, in which he is contesting a denial of unemployment compensation, “intentionally stalling the ruling.” He also claims that the subject judge “illegally changed venue.”

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.

Any allegation of delay that the complainant may be making is belied by the record, which shows that the case was dismissed less than a week after it was filed. And nothing in the record shows that venue was changed in the case. Because the complainant’s allegations are frivolous and lack sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct occurred, the complaint will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(C) & (D) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

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

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

Date: July 11, 2018