FILED
SEP 15 2026
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JUDICIAL COUNCIL

OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT

IN RE COMPLAINT OF	No. 25-90283
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT	**ORDER**

MURGUIA, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a magistrate 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 magistrate judge committed misconduct by denying's complainant's motion to issue a subpoena relating to a federal case proceeding in another district court. The Clerk's Office initially issued the subpoena but immediately withdrew the subpoena as issued in error. In the order denying complainant's motion, the magistrate judge explained why the subpoena had been issued and withdrawn; the order then explained that complainant was already in possession of a valid subpoena, and that complainant should file a new motion if complainant needed to enforce the valid subpoena.

Complainant's allegation regarding the denial of the motion challenges the correctness of the magistrate judge's decision. "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 magistrate judge's decision. *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 magistrate judge failed to explain why the subpoena had been issued and then withdrawn. A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge did explain this issue in the order denying the motion. Thus, 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); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

DISMISSED.