

**FILED**

JUN 18 2018

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF  
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 18-90051

**ORDER**

**THOMAS**, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a defendant in a criminal case, 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 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 judge improperly ordered complainant detained pending trial, improperly denied a motion to suppress, and made various other improper rulings in the underlying case. These allegations relate directly to the merits of the judge's rulings and must be dismissed. 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).

Next, complainant alleges that the judge colluded with the government to impose unreasonable deadlines and chastised defense counsel in a minute order for requesting a continuance. This allegation is belied by the record, which shows that several continuances have in fact been granted. Moreover, the minute order cited by complainant simply reminded counsel that it was improper to telephone chambers directly, and that counsel was expected to follow all applicable court rules. Accordingly, this charge is dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C.

§ 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Finally, complainant alleges that the judge's rulings demonstrate bias. However, adverse rulings are not proof of bias, and complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support these allegations, which are dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

**DISMISSED.**