

**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. 25-90216

**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 committed misconduct by denying his requests to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP requests”) and by issuing an order to show cause after complainant failed to pay the filing fee. “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 that the district judge failed to provide an adequate explanation for the denial of his IFP requests. A review of the record indicates the

district judge explained in detail the reasons for denying complainant's IFP requests. Therefore, this allegation is dismissed as unfounded and belied by the record. *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).

Finally, complainant alleges that all the rulings of the district judge demonstrate bias, obstruct his access to the courts, and deny him his civil rights. However, adverse rulings are not proof of bias. *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 650 F.3d 1370, 1371 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011). Because complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support these allegations, they are dismissed as unfounded. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

**DISMISSED.**