JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

In re:	*	
	*	
Complaint of Judicial Misconduct	*	06-25-90182
	*	06-26-90024
	*	06-26-90025
	*	
	*	
	*	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

These complaints of judicial misconduct were filed by [redacted] ("complainant") against [redacted] ("subject judges"). *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 an incarcerated pro se litigant who has filed repetitive federal lawsuits stemming from his state criminal case. The subject judges presided over the complainant's many federal cases. The complainant was eventually designated a three-strike filer under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and he has incurred sanctions for violating the filing restrictions imposed upon him.

These misconduct complaints allege that the subject judges are blocking his lawsuits to protect those involved with the state criminal case.

The complaints warrant dismissal. Taken together, they appear to challenge the subject judges' decisions to dismiss the underlying cases and impose filing restrictions. The judicial-complaint process may not be used to challenge the merits of judicial decisions 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 warrant dismissal because they are merits-related. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

To the extent the complaints allege that the subject judges have engaged in a conspiracy to prevent the complainant from pursuing claims against those involved with his state criminal case, they are also dismissed. Apart from disagreement with the subject judges' rulings, the complaints cite no evidence to support this allegation. The conspiracy allegations are therefore dismissed as lacking sufficient evidence to suggest 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 complaints 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 11, 2026