

JUL 20 2018

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

Nos. 18-90055 and 18-90056

**ORDER****THOMAS**, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se prisoner, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a magistrate judge and 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 judges 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 magistrate judge improperly recommended the dismissal of his habeas petition, and that the district judge improperly adopted that recommendation. These allegations relate directly to the merits of the judges' 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).

Complainant also alleges that the judges were biased against him. Complainant contends that the magistrate judge committed "perjury" by misstating facts and the law in the report and recommendation, and that the district judge "solicited" this alleged perjury. Adverse rulings are not evidence of bias or falsehoods, 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, 838 F.3d 1030 (9th Cir.

Jud. Council 2016); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant has filed two previous misconduct complaints naming over 20 judges, including the two current subject judges. 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, Nos. 15-90151+. Accordingly, complainant is ordered to show cause why he should not be sanctioned by a restrictive filing order. 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.**