

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

J.C. No. 03-15-90090

---

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT  
OR DISABILITY

---

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 351

---

MEMORANDUM OPINION

---

(Filed: November 5, 2015)

PRESENT: AMBRO, Circuit Judge.<sup>1</sup>

This complaint is filed under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-64, against a United States Circuit Judge (the “Subject Judge”). For the reasons discussed below, the complaint will be dismissed.

The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act provides a remedy if a federal judge “has engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts.” 28 U.S.C. § 351(a). A chief judge may dismiss a complaint if, after review, he or she finds it is not cognizable under the statute, is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling, or is frivolous or lacks sufficient evidence to raise an inference of misconduct. 28 U.S.C. §§ 352(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iii).

---

<sup>1</sup> Acting as chief judge for purposes of disposition of this complaint, pursuant to Rule 25(f), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

Complainant is a frequent pro se litigant. She has filed numerous civil actions over the course of several years. In May 2015, Complainant filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against the District Judge who dismissed one such action. See J.C. No. 03-15-90028. The Subject Judge dismissed that misconduct complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii). Complainant did not file a petition for review and the matter is concluded.

In this second complaint of judicial misconduct, Complainant alleges the Subject Judge's decision reflects an "intentional 'misunderstanding'" of her first complaint of judicial misconduct. Complainant contends that the alleged "manipulation and miscomprehension of the clearly stated facts" was designed by the Subject Judge to "extricate one of his subordinates from the quagmire. . . ." Complainant concludes that, by these alleged actions, the Subject Judge "'join[ed] in' to the clearly criminal actions by his subordinate."

Complainant's allegations are plainly merits-related. Complainant takes issue with the findings and conclusions reached by the Subject Judge in the course of the prior misconduct proceeding. "An allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge's ruling . . . is merits-related." Rule 3(h)(3)(A), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. This rule applies to allegations concerning rulings rendered in the course of a judicial misconduct proceeding. See Commentary to Rule 3, Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings ("[A] complaint challenging the correctness of a chief judge's determination to dismiss a prior misconduct

complaint would be properly dismissed as merits-related . . . even though it does not concern the judge's rulings in Article III litigation.”). A disagreement with the merits of a judicial ruling does not give rise to cognizable misconduct. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Rules 3(h)(3)(A), 11(c)(1)(B), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

Complainant declined to pursue a proper challenge to the Subject Judge's disposition of the first misconduct complaint by filing a petition for review with the Judicial Council pursuant to Rule 18, Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. That decision is now final. Complainant's attempt to challenge the decision by filing a new misconduct complaint is entirely inappropriate. The “misconduct procedure [under the Act] is not designed as a substitute for, or supplement to, appeals or motions for reconsideration. Nor is it designed to provide an avenue for collateral attacks or other challenges to judges' rulings.” In re Memorandum of Decision of Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability, 517 F.3d 558, 561 (U.S. Jud. Conf. 2008). Accordingly, Complainant's merits-related allegations are dismissed.

It is apparent that Complainant's allegations that the Subject Judge somehow conspired with or covered up for the actions of a District Judge pertain solely to her disagreement with the Subject Judge's ruling. The allegations are otherwise unsubstantiated. Accordingly, to the extent Complainant has presented any non-merits-related allegations, they are dismissed as frivolous and unsupported by evidence that

would raise an inference that misconduct has occurred. 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Rule 11(c)(1)(C), (D), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

For the foregoing reasons, this complaint is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii). Complainant's attention is directed to Rule 10(a), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.<sup>2</sup> Complainant is cautioned that future abuse of the judicial misconduct complaint procedure may result in the imposition of restrictions under that rule.

s/ Thomas L. Ambro  
Circuit Judge

---

<sup>2</sup> Rule 10(a), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, states:

Abusive Complaints. A complainant who has filed repetitive, harassing, or frivolous complaints, or has otherwise abused the complaint procedure, may be restricted from filing further complaints. After giving the complainant an opportunity to show cause in writing why his or her right to file further complaints should not be limited, a judicial council may prohibit, restrict, or impose conditions on the complainant's use of the complaint procedure. Upon written request of the complainant, the judicial council may revise or withdraw any prohibition, restriction, or condition previously imposed.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

J.C. No. 03-13-90090

---

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT  
OR DISABILITY

---

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 351

---

ORDER

---

(Filed: November 5, 2015)

PRESENT: AMBRO, Circuit Judge.<sup>1</sup>

On the basis of the foregoing opinion entered on this date, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the written complaint brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 351 is hereby dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii).

This order constitutes a final order under 28 U.S.C. § 352(c). Complainant is notified in accordance with Rules 11(g)(3) and 18, Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, of the right to appeal this decision by the following procedure:

Rule 18(a) Petition. A complainant or subject judge may petition the Judicial Council of the Third Circuit for review.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acting as chief judge for purposes of disposition of this complaint, pursuant to Rule 25(f), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings.

Rule 18(b) Time. A petition for review must be filed in the Office of the Circuit Executive of the Court of Appeals within **35 days** of the date on the letter informing the parties of the Chief Judge's order.

18(b) Form. The petition should be in letter form, addressed to the Circuit Executive of the Court of Appeals, and in an envelope marked "Misconduct Petition" or "Disability Petition." The name of the subject judge must not be shown on the envelope. The letter should be typewritten or otherwise legible. It should begin with "I hereby petition the judicial council for review of . . ." and state the reasons why the petition should be granted. It must be signed. There is no need to enclose a copy of the original complaint.

The full text of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings is available from the Office of the Circuit Executive of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and on the Court of Appeals' internet site, [www.ca3.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca3.uscourts.gov).

s/ Thomas L. Ambro  
Circuit Judge

Dated: November 5, 2015