

FILED

DEC 12 2018

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 18-90119

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.

To the extent complainant alleges that the judge improperly dismissed her underlying civil complaint or made other improper rulings in the underlying case, such 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 alleges that the judge has committed “an act of criminal collusion,” has accepted bribes, and is mentally incompetent. However, adverse rulings are not proof of misconduct or disability, and complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support these vague and speculative allegations, which must be dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 900 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2018) (“adverse rulings are not proof of misconduct”); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 650 F.3d 1370, 1371 (9th Cir. 2011) (“adverse rulings do not prove bias or conspiracy”); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 569 F.3d 1093 (9th

Cir. Jud. Council 2009) (“claimant’s vague insinuations do not provide the kind of objectively verifiable proof that we require”); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Finally, complainant alleges that the judge failed to manually sign his orders. However, judges are not required to sign their orders, and failing to do so is not “prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts.” Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(A); see also In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, No. 11-90097 (9th Cir. Jud. Council, July 29, 2011).

Accordingly, this allegation is dismissed for failure to allege cognizable misconduct.

DISMISSED.