JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90094
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

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

The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act permits any person alleging that a judge has engaged in misconduct to file "a written complaint containing a brief statement of the facts constituting such conduct." 28 U.S.C. § 351(a). After conducting an initial review, the chief judge may dismiss any complaint that is "not in conformity with section 351(a)." *See id.* § 352(b)(1)(A)(i).

The subject judge presided over the complainant's pro se civil suit, during which she designated him a vexatious litigator and struck some 70 of his filings from the docket. She later granted summary judgment to the defendant.

This misconduct complaint does not contain a brief statement of facts as required by § 351(a). *See also* Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Rule 6(b) (requiring "a concise statement that details the specific facts on which the claim of misconduct . . . is based"). Rather, the complaint contains hand-written sentence fragments, including: "court engaging in murder for hire rape conspiracy," "house entrusion HIPPA [sic] violation," "wife medical coder," and "witness victim retaliation ADA retaliation prohibited."

These sentence fragments cannot be construed as a statement of facts in support of a misconduct complaint. Because this complaint is not in conformity with the statute or Rules governing misconduct proceedings, it is dismissed.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the complaint be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(i).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: September 17, 2025