JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90177
	*	
	*	
	*	
	*	

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." 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. The subject judge presided over the complainant's case.

This is the second misconduct complaint filed by the complainant against the subject judge. The first complaint, which related to the same underlying case, was dismissed as merit-related and lacking sufficient evidence to infer misconduct. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii)–(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rules 11(c)(1)(B) and (D).

The present misconduct complaint alleges that the subject judge engaged in a host of misconduct while presiding in the underlying case. The allegations include failing to rule on a recusal motion, improper use of sanctions, misapplying the law, improper procedural rulings, and due process violations. The complaint also alleges that the subject judge "used improper pressure and misapplied law to coerce [the complainant] into signing a settlement agreement." Compl. 2.

This complaint warrants dismissal. As with the prior misconduct complaint, most of the 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 or procedural rulings made in underlying proceedings, "including a failure to recuse." *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 (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 claim that the subject judge coerced the complainant into signing a settlement agreement is also dismissed. The complaint alleges that the subject judge used adverse rulings, threats of sanctions, and filing restrictions to "create[] a coercive environment" in which the complainant was "compelled to accept a settlement." Compl. 3. As the complaint offers no support for this claim apart from disagreement with the subject judge's rulings, it will be dismissed as lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

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) and (D).

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sutton
Chief Judge

Date: May 6, 2026