JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90037
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by [redacted] ("complainant") against [redacted] ("subject judge"), under 28 U.S.C. § 351. The complaint alleges that the subject judge extended personal favors to and engaged in ex parte communications with an opposing party in the complainant's underlying suit.

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 complainant is a pro se litigant who filed a civil suit against several celebrities. The subject judge presided over the complainant's case.

This is the second misconduct complaint the complainant has filed against the subject judge. The previous complaint ended in dismissal. The present complaint alleges that a defendant from the underlying suit visited the city where the subject judge's court is located. In support, the complaint cites public flight records for the defendant's private jet. From this information, the complaint finds it "not only reasonable but plausible" that the defendant was traveling to engage in improper ex parte communication with the subject judge.

This complaint warrants dismissal because its allegations are not supported by credible evidence. Even if it is true that the defendant's jet traveled to the city where the

subject judge presides, it does not follow that the subject judge engaged in improper communications with the defendant. This complaint is therefore subject to dismissal as lacking sufficient evidence to suggest that misconduct has occurred. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

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)(D).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: June 2, 2025