

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

J.C. No. 03-21-90034

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT
OR DISABILITY

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

(Filed: August 26, 2021)

PRESENT: SMITH, *Chief Judge*.

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

Complainant filed a pro se employment discrimination suit, which was assigned to the Subject Judge. The Subject Judge dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim and granted leave to amend within thirty days. When no amended complaint was

received, the matter was closed. Several months later, Complainant filed a motion to reopen the proceeding. The Subject Judge denied the motion. Complainant appealed and the appeal remains pending.

In this complaint of judicial misconduct, Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge “den[ied Complainant] the lawful rights to have [Complainant’s] case re-open[ed].” In addition, Complainant requests the Subject Judge’s recusal.

It is apparent that Complainant’s allegations reflect a disagreement with the merits of the Subject Judge’s denial of reopening. Such allegations are merits-related and do not constitute cognizable misconduct. Rule 4(b)(1), *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings* (“Cognizable misconduct does not include an allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge’s ruling. . . .”). “The misconduct procedure [under the Judicial Conduct and Disability 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). Complainant’s merits-related allegations are therefore subject to dismissal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Rules 4(b)(1), 11(c)(1)(B), *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings*.

Moreover, although Complainant requests recusal in this administrative proceeding, a review of the docket in Complainant’s civil case reveals that Complainant has never filed a motion seeking that relief. A request for recusal must be presented to the

presiding judge in the first instance. A substantive decision rendered on a recusal motion is merits-related and non-cognizable. *See* Rule 4(b)(1), *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings*.

Finally, to the extent Complainant presents any allegations of misconduct not based upon a dispute with the merits of the Subject Judge's rulings, such allegations are lacking in evidentiary support. The record in Complainant's civil proceeding reveals no basis for a claim of judicial misconduct. Accordingly, any remaining allegations are subject to dismissal 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*.

Based on the foregoing, this complaint will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii).

s/ D. Brooks Smith
Chief Judge

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

J.C. No. 03-21-90034

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT
OR DISABILITY

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

ORDER

(Filed: August 26, 2021)

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)(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.

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: August 26, 2021