

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

FILED

JUL 14 2026

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

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 26-90036

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 delayed taking any action on his filings. A review of the record indicates that the district judge denied complainant's request to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed complainant's action several days before complainant filed his misconduct complaint. The record also indicates that the district judge resolved the lawsuit within several months of the lawsuit's filing. Furthermore, without a showing of an "improper motive in delaying a particular decision or a habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases," delay alone is not cognizable misconduct. *See* Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2). Complainant has failed to provide any evidence of an improper motive or habitual delay. 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).

DISMISSED.