

**FILED**

OCT 13 2015

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF  
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

Nos. 15-90119, 15-90120,  
15-90134, 15-90135, 15-90136  
and 15-90137

**ORDER**

**THOMAS**, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, filed four separate misconduct complaints naming two circuit judges, three district judges and one magistrate judge.

Complainant alleges that two district judges improperly dismissed her underlying civil rights actions, improperly processed her application to proceed in forma pauperis, improperly construed her filings, and made other various improper rulings in the underlying proceedings. Complainant also alleges that the two circuit judges improperly denied in forma pauperis status on appeal, on the ground that the appeal was frivolous. These allegations relate directly to the merits of the judges' rulings and must be dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); In re Charge of Judicial Misconduct, 685 F.2d 1226, 1227 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 1982); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

Complainant further alleges that the district judges are racially biased, that one district judge was “arrogant and power-abusing,” and that another district

judge harassed and discriminated against complainant. Adverse rulings are not proof of bias, see In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009), and complainant provides no objectively verifiable proof that either judge treated her in a demonstrably egregious or hostile manner, and accordingly these allegations are dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 761 F.3d 1097, 1098-99 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2014); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009); Judicial-Conduct Rules 3(h)(1)(D), 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant alleges that one district judge has an agenda to assist the police department in a cover up. Adverse rulings alone do not prove conspiracy, see In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009), and complainant's "vague insinuations do not provide the kind of objectively verifiable proof that we require." In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 569 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, these allegations are dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant's allegation that a magistrate judge and district judge have "ignored" or "not answered" her motion for reconsideration is dismissed, because the record shows that the motion was in fact ruled on less than a week after it was

filed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rules 3(h)(3)(B), 11(c)(1)(D).

As noted, complainant has filed four separate misconduct complaints against a total of six judges, and makes vague and unsupported allegations of bias, conspiracy and hostility. Complainant is cautioned that a “complainant who has filed repetitive, harassing, or frivolous complaints, or has otherwise abused the complaint procedure, may be restricted from filing further complaints.”

Judicial-Conduct Rule 10(a); see also In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 552 F.3d 1146, 1148 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009).

**DISMISSED.**