

FILED

OCT 19 2018

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 18-90085

ORDER

THOMAS, 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.

First, complainant alleges that the judge improperly denied his request for in forma pauperis status, improperly dismissed the underlying civil complaint, and made various other improper rulings. 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).

Complainant also alleges that the judge "colluded" with the Department of Justice to commit various crimes and wrongdoings. However, adverse rulings are not proof of conspiracy or other misconduct, 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, 715 F.3d 747, 749 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2013) ("As we have frequently held, adverse rulings, standing alone, are not proof of misconduct"); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 650 F.3d 1370, 1371 (9th Cir. Jud. Council

2011) (“adverse rulings do not prove bias or conspiracy”); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

To the extent complainant alleges that court staff prohibited him from entering the courthouse with a service dog, such allegations are dismissed as non-cognizable because this misconduct complaint procedure applies only to federal judges. See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 632 F.3d 1287, 1288 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011); Judicial-Conduct Rule 4.

DISMISSED.