

FILED

MAR 24 2015

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 14-90106

ORDER

THOMAS, Chief Judge:

A pro se prisoner alleges that a district judge made improper rulings in his criminal trial and related garnishment proceedings, including failing to recuse. These allegations relate directly to the merits of the judge's rulings and must therefore be dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 623 F.3d 1101, 1102 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2010) (holding that the decision not to recuse is merits-related); In re Charge of Judicial Misconduct, 685 F.2d 1226, 1227 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 1982); see also Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

Complainant further alleges that the judge is biased against him and conspired with the prosecution to deprive him of his rights. Adverse rulings cannot alone prove bias or a conspiracy. See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598, 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009). Because complainant offers no other evidence to support his claims, these charges are

dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant claims that judge delayed his criminal case. Delay is not cognizable misconduct “unless the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases.” Judicial-Conduct Rule 3(h)(3)(B); see In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 567 F.3d 429, 431 (9th Cir. 2009). Complainant has not provided any objective evidence that the alleged delay was habitual or improperly motivated. Because there is no evidence of misconduct, this charge must be dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

DISMISSED.