FILED

AUG 24 2015

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JUDICIAL COUNCIL

OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT

IN RE COMPLAINT OF	No. 15-90036
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT	**ORDER**

THOMAS, Chief Judge:

Complainant alleges that a district judge was biased against him in two civil cases, citing adverse decisions on the merits in those cases as proof of such bias. Adverse rulings alone cannot prove bias. See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009). Complainant has not provided any objectively verifiable evidence to support his allegation of bias, which must therefore be dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant further alleges that a district judge erroneously allowed attorneys not admitted to practice before the district court to file documents in his civil cases. Complainant's allegation lacks substantiation in the record. Accordingly, this allegation must be dismissed as unsupported. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 567 F.3d 429, 431 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant further alleges that a district judge unduly delayed consideration of his pro se submissions and directed her clerk to delay filing of his materials. An allegation of delay is not cognizable "unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases." Judicial-Conduct Rule 3(h)(3)(B). None of complainant's allegations are supported by objectively verifiable evidence. These allegations must therefore be dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant further alleges that he is sovereign and neither the district court nor this court has jurisdiction over him. This contention is frivolous and without merit. See, e.g., United States v. Masat, 948 F.2d 923, 934 (5th Cir. 1991) (rejecting as frivolous litigant's claim that the district court lacked jurisdiction because litigant was a "freeman").

DISMISSED.