JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90128
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	

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." Rule 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 pro se complainant's underlying civil case. The misconduct complaint alleges that the subject judge improperly ruled in that case. It accuses her of failing to liberally construe a pro se complaint, improperly denying the complainant an opportunity to amend the complaint, disregarding key evidence, and certifying that an appeal could not be taken in good faith. It makes no further accusations or claims.

This complaint warrants dismissal. The complainant's allegations challenge the merits of the subject judge's decisions in the underlying case. 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 cases. *See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 858 F.2d 331, 332 (6th Cir.

1988). These allegations thus warrant dismissal because they are merits-related. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the complaint be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: February 25, 2026