

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

In re:
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct

*
*
*No. 06-18-90065
*
*
*
*

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. The complainant charges the subject judge, who presided over and dismissed a civil action the complainant had brought against an insurance company for damages arising from an auto accident, with a disability that “derives from his secret covenant to serve the Southern Pagan Clan against justice and the plaintiff’s interest.” According to the complainant, this clan, which is based in Atlanta, Georgia, has a secret computer network that they use to “dictate to members all the illegal actions to be taken against” those who oppose it. The complainant is one of those who oppose it, and, as a result, the subject judge was apparently compelled to deny the complainant’s motion to recuse and to ultimately dismiss the underlying action.

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.

Complainant’s allegations regarding the existence of and the subject judge’s membership in the “Southern Pagan Clan” are fantastical, delusional, and entirely unsupported by any evidence. They are therefore subject to dismissal as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii) and Rule 11(c)(1)(C) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

To the extent the complainant is attempting to challenge rulings made by the subject judge in the underlying proceedings, he may not use the judicial complaint process to do so. Such challenges 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). This complaint is therefore subject to dismissal in part 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.

Accordingly, 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: January 9, 2019