JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90034
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by [redacted] ("complainant") against [redacted] ("subject judge"), under 28 U.S.C. § 351. The complainant alleges the subject judge conspired with another judge to cover up misconduct in the judiciary.

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." Rules 11(c)(1)(A)–(D), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings ("Judicial-Conduct Rules"); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(a), (b).

The subject judge presided over two of the complainant's pro se petitions for mandamus. The complaint is difficult to follow, but it appears to allege that the subject judge is a member of a criminal conspiracy that involves a public official and other judges. It accuses the subject judge of issuing "completely fabricated illegal, fraudulent, bogus orders" in two of the complainant's mandamus cases. The purpose of this conspiracy, it alleges, is to "cover up" misconduct in the judiciary and the Department of Justice. Related misconduct complaints filed against some of the other judges alleged to be involved have ended in dismissal.

This complaint also warrants dismissal. The claim that the subject judge engaged in a conspiracy and fabricated court orders is wholly unsupported by credible evidence and subject to dismissal 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)(iii) and Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(C).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: May 22, 2025