JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaints of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90151
	*	06-25-90152
	*	06-25-90153
	*	06-25-90154
	*	06-25-90155
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This complaint of judicial misconduct was filed by [redacted] ("complainant") against [redacted] ("subject judge 1"), [redacted] ("subject judge 2"), [redacted] ("subject judge 3"), [redacted] ("subject judge 4"), and [redacted] ("subject judge 5"). *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).

The complainant filed a civil suit in the Eastern District of Michigan. Subject judge 1 concluded that the case had been filed in the wrong venue and transferred it to the Western District of Michigan. Subject judge 4 then presided over the case. After the complainant failed to pay a filing fee and submit a compliant signature page, subject judge 4 dismissed the case.

More than three years later, the complainant moved to reopen the case. She simultaneously began contacting court staff and judges about the case. Subject judge 2

issued several orders directing the complainant to cease all communications with judicial officers.

This misconduct complaint challenges various rulings from the underlying case, including the denial of motions to proceed in forma pauperis, the denial of access to electronic filing, and the orders directing the complainant to cease communications with judges and court staff. Subject judges 3 and 5, who did not issue rulings in the underlying case, appear to have been recipients of the complainant's communications.

This complaint warrants dismissal. The allegations against subject judges 1, 2, and 4 challenge their 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 judges' rulings or to grant relief requested in the underlying case. *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).

As for subject judges 3 and 5, this complaint makes no specific allegations about their conduct. It is therefore also 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 Rule 11(c)(1)(B) and (C).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: April 17, 2026