JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaints of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90112
	*	06-25-90113
	*	
	*	
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by [redacted] ("complainant") against [redacted] *See* 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).

Subject judge 1 presided over several of the complainant's pro se lawsuits and referred certain pretrial matters to subject judge 2. Because of the complainant's history of filing "repetitive and meritless motions" in many cases, subject judge 1 enjoined her from further filings absent leave of court. Subject judge 1 also struck several of the complainant's filings from the docket.

This misconduct complaint alleges that subject judge 1 "oppressed [the complainant's] right" to file notices of appeal by revoking her filing privileges. It challenges the decision to strike her filings and other rulings in the underlying cases. The complaint also asserts that the subject judge 1 accepted bribes to dismiss the complainant's cases. It does not appear to contain any specific allegations against subject judge 2.

As an initial matter, the complaint is focused on subject judge 1 and contains no concrete allegations against subject judge 2. The complaint against subject judge 2 is

therefore dismissed as lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that subject judge 2 committed misconduct. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

The allegations against subject judge 1 also warrant dismissal. Most of the allegations challenge the merits of subject judge 1's decisions in the underlying cases. 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 subject judge 1's rulings or to grant relief requested in the underlying cases. *See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 858 F.2d 331 (6th Cir. 1988). These allegations warrant dismissal because they are merits-related. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

The allegations that subject judge 1 accepted bribes to rule against the complainant are unsupported by any credible evidence. The complaint's only support for this allegation is wild and baseless speculation about subject judge 1's religious affiliation. These allegations are thus 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 Judicial-Conduct Rules 11(c)(1)(B), (C) and (D).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: November 3, 2025