

AUG 17 2016

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT****IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**Nos. 16-90096, 16-90097,
16-90098, 16-90099, 16-90100
and 16-90101**ORDER****THOMAS**, Chief Judge:

A pro se litigant alleges that four district judges and two magistrate judges made “rogue” rulings in his civil cases. Any disagreement complainant has with the judges’ rulings is merits-related and not cognizable in a misconduct proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); In re Charge of Judicial Misconduct, 685 F.2d 1226, 1227 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 1982); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

Complainant alleges that one of the judges may have “informants” providing information that the judge is “using towards corruption.” However, adverse rulings alone cannot prove conspiracy. See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009). Because complainant offers no other evidence to support his claim, this charge is dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

In a previous order, complainant was cautioned that a “complainant who has filed repetitive, harassing, or frivolous complaints, or has otherwise abused the complaint procedure, may be restricted from filing further complaints.” See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, No. 15-90122+. Accordingly, complainant is ordered to show cause why he should not be sanctioned by an order requiring him to obtain leave before filing any further misconduct complaints. See Judicial-Conduct Rule 10(a); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 552 F.3d 1146, 1148 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009). Complainant has thirty-five days from the filing of this order to file a response, which will be transmitted to the Judicial Council for its consideration.

DISMISSED and COMPLAINANT ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE.