

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

FILED

JUL 2 2026

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

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 25-90212

ORDER

MURGUIA, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a district judge. 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 name 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 judge improperly failed to address complainant's arguments as well as materials complainant submitted in district court. These allegations constitute a challenge to the correctness of the district judge's decision to grant motions in favor of defendant instead of complainant, as well as the decision to dismiss complainant's action. "Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge — without more — is merits-related. The phrase 'decision or procedural ruling' is not limited to rulings issued in deciding Article III cases or controversies." Commentary on Judicial-Conduct Rule 4. Therefore, these allegations are dismissed as a challenge to the merits of the district judge's decisions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) (listing reasons the chief judge may decide to dismiss the complaint, including that claims are directly related to the merits of a decision); *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 838 F.3d 1030 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2016) (dismissing as merits-related allegations that a judge made various improper rulings in a case); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

Complainant also alleges the district judge favors corporate defendants over individual defendants. Complainant has presented no objectively verifiable evidence supporting this allegation; thus this allegation is dismissed as unfounded. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii) (listing reasons the chief judge may decide to dismiss the complaint, including claims that are lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred); *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.