

Jan.19 2024

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT****IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 22-90044

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 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 judge abused his discretion by failing to report that witnesses in the underlying state court case committed perjury. This allegation fails to allege cognizable misconduct. See Rule 4(a) (defining cognizable misconduct as being “prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts”). Accordingly, complainant provides no evidence of misconduct, and this allegation must be dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii) (listing reasons the chief judge may decide to dismiss the complaint, including lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(A), (D).

DISMISSED.