

FILED

JUL 9 2020

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

Nos. 20-90027, 20-90028,
20-90029, 20-90060 and
20-90061

ORDER

THOMAS, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a district court judge and four circuit court judges. Review of this complaint is governed by the Rules for Judicial Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings (“Judicial-Conduct Rules”), the federal statutes addressing judicial conduct and disability, 28 U.S.C. § 351 *et seq.*, and relevant prior decisions of the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council. In accordance with these authorities, the names of complainant and the subject judge shall not be disclosed in this order. See Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(g)(2).

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, following 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.

See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(I)-(iii). Judicial misconduct proceedings are not a substitute for the normal appellate review process, and may not be used to seek reversal of a judge's decision, to obtain a new trial, or to request reassignment to a different judge.

Complainant alleges that the district court judge failed to consider a crucial piece of evidence and, as a result, failed to hold a hearing on the merits of the case. These allegations relate directly to the merits of the judge's 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's allegations that two of the circuit judges wrongly refused to consider the overlooked piece of evidence and denied his request for appointment of counsel must be dismissed for the same reason, as does complainant's claim that the two other circuit judges again denied his request for counsel and refused to "overturn" the district court judge's rulings on immunity.

Complainant also alleges that the district court judge's handling of the case was unduly influenced by his relationship to the defendants. Complainant speculates that the circuit judges may also have been biased or may have had

personal relationships with the defendants. Adverse rulings are not proof of misconduct or bias, and complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support these vague and conclusory allegations, which are dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 715 F.3d 747, 749 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2013) (“As we have frequently held, adverse rulings, standing alone, are not proof of misconduct”); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 569 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009) (“claimant’s vague insinuations do not provide the kind of objectively verifiable proof that we require”); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

DISMISSED.