JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaints of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90011
	*	06-25-90012
	*	06-25-90013
	*	06-25-90014
	*	06-24-90015
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by [redacted] ("complainant") against [redacted] ("subject judges"), under 28 U.S.C. § 351. The complaint alleges the subject judges engaged in "a series of unlawful acts and misconduct" resulting in the theft of the complainant's property.

After conducting an initial review, the chief judge may dismiss a complaint of judicial misconduct 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 ("Judicial-Conduct Rules"); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(a), (b). Because the chief circuit judge is a subject of this complaint, the complaint has been referred to the next most senior active circuit judge for review. *See* Rule 24(f), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial Disability Proceedings.

The complainant is a pro se litigant who initiated numerous cases in federal and state courts. This flurry of litigation eventually led the district court to issue an omnibus order deeming the complainant a vexatious litigator and to impose filing restrictions. In consolidated appeals, the complainant challenged the vexatious litigator order and moved to proceed in forma pauperis. The subject judges presided over these consolidated appeals, except for the chief judge, who has no apparent connection to the complainant.

Although difficult to follow, the misconduct complaint cites a list of cases and Ohio attorneys as evidence of widespread fraud and misconduct within the state's legal system. The complainant alleges that the subject judges "have actively participated in the cover-up of these crimes and continue to deny justice by refusing to properly address the underlying criminal acts and misconduct."

This complaint is subject to dismissal. To the extent that the complainant is alleging that the subject judges made improper rulings in the handling of her consolidated appeals, the complainant is attempting to challenge the merits of their decisions. The judicial-complaint process may not be used to challenge the merits of judicial decisions made in the underlying proceedings; such decisions are not the proper subject of a complaint of judicial misconduct. *See* Rule 4(b)(1), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. The Judicial Council is not a court and has no jurisdiction to review the subject judges' 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 as directly related to the merits of the subject judges' decisions in the underlying proceedings. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Rule 11(c)(1)(B) Judicial-Conduct Rules.

To the extent the complaint alleges the subject judges engaged in "unlawful acts and misconduct," this portion of the complaint is also dismissed. The complainant has offered no factual basis to support these allegations, so they are dismissed as frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(C).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the complaint be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii)–(iii) and Rules 11(c)(1)(B) and (C) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial Disability Proceedings.

/s/ Karen Nelson Moore
Circuit Judge

Date: March 14, 2025