JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re: Complaint of Judicial Misconduct	* * * * * * *	06-25-90060

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by [redacted] ("complainant") against [redacted] ("subject judge"), under 28 U.S.C. § 351.

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 the complainant's underlying pro se civil suit. He ultimately dismissed the case and denied various post-judgment motions. This is the second misconduct complaint the complainant has filed against the subject judge; the first one, which related to the same underlying lawsuit, ended in dismissal.

This newest misconduct complaint, though lengthy, essentially alleges that the subject judge improperly ruled in the complainant's underlying case and engaged in a conspiracy with a city, a police department, and members of a family.

The claims that the subject judge made improper rulings warrant dismissal. The judicial-complaint process may not be used to challenge the merits of judicial decisions made in underlying proceedings; such decisions are not the proper subject of a complaint of judicial misconduct. *See* Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(1). The Judicial Council is not a court and has no jurisdiction to review the subject 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). Accordingly, these allegations are dismissed because they are merits-related. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

The conspiracy claim also warrants dismissal. The complainant has not provided credible evidence to substantiate the allegation that the subject judge acted "to continue hiding . . . corruption." This claim is therefore dismissed as lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference of misconduct. *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)(ii)–(iii) and Judicial-Conduct Rules 11(c)(1)(B) and (D).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: August 8, 2025