

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

J.C. No. 03-16-90067

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT
OR DISABILITY

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

(Filed: February 13, 2017)

PRESENT: SMITH, Chief Judge.

This is a complaint filed under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-64, against a United States District Judge (hereinafter “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). 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).

As a preliminary matter, Complainant makes allegations concerning individuals who are not subject to the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act; e.g., Clerk's Office employees. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 351, 352(b)(1)(A)(i); Rule 4, Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. Accordingly, these allegations will not be addressed in this opinion.

Complainant complains about the putative delay in the assignment of a case number to his complaint and delay in ruling on his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. These allegations are dismissed as merits-related. 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Rules 3(h)(3)(A), 3(h)(3)(B) (cognizable misconduct does not include "an allegation about delay in rendering a decision or ruling, unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases"), 11(c)(1)(B), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. See also Commentary on Rule 3(h)(3)(B) ("With regard to Rule 3(h)(3)(B), a complaint of delay in a single case is excluded as merits-related. Such an allegation may be said to challenge the correctness of an official action of the judge — in other words, assigning a low priority to deciding the particular case.").

To the extent Complainant suggests there was an improper motive for the Subject Judge's putative delay, his allegations are subject to dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii). The Subject Judge denied Complainant's initial motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* without prejudice because Complainant failed to sign the original form of affidavit in support of the application and Complainant failed to provide sufficient information for the Court to determine whether he was entitled to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Complainant was provided another opportunity to submit the form in question. The record reflects that, since the filing of his complaint of judicial misconduct, Complainant has filed another motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, as well as an amended complaint. Both remain pending at this time and there is no evidence to support Complainant's allegations concerning the "clogging of due process" and/or "treason." Complainant's allegations of misconduct are dismissed as frivolous and unsupported by any 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, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(i), (ii), and (iii).

s/ D. Brooks Smith
Chief Judge

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

J.C. No. 03-16-90067

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT
OR DISABILITY

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

ORDER

(Filed: February 13, 2017)

PRESENT: SMITH, Chief Judge.

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)(i), (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.

Rule 18(b) Time. A petition for review must be filed in the Office of the Circuit Executive within **42 days** after the date of the chief judge's order.

Rule 18(b) Form. The petition should be in letter form, addressed to the Circuit Executive, 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 and on the Court of Appeals’ internet site, www.ca3.uscourts.gov.

s/ D. Brooks Smith
Chief Judge

Dated: February 13, 2017