JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaints of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90166
	*	06-25-90167
	*	
	*	
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

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

The complainant is a pro se litigant with an extensive history of frivolous filings in a district court in the Sixth Circuit. The complainant filed one case in the subject judges' district and entered an appearance in another, related case. In his capacity as the chief district judge, subject judge 1 reassigned the newly filed case to subject judge 2, who was already presiding over the related case. He also imposed filing restrictions on the complainant due to her history of vexatious filings and apparent unauthorized practice of law. Subject judge 2 later dismissed the pre-existing case. His dismissal order notified the complainant that "future attempts to represent other individuals and/or entities . . . will result in sanctions."

This misconduct complaint challenges the subject judges' orders. It contends that they "exceeded judicial authority" and denied the complainant "meaningful access to the courts and to procedural protections." Compl. 1. The complaint requests that "the Sixth

Circuit . . . examine whether the orders" complied with all applicable rules and precedents. Compl. 3.

This complaint warrants dismissal. The allegations directly challenge the judicial orders in the underlying cases. The judicial-complaint process may not be used to challenge the merits of judicial decisions or procedural rulings made in underlying proceedings. *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 cases. *See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 858 F.2d 331 (6th Cir. 1988). These allegations are thus dismissed 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: May 1, 2026