

**FILED**

FEB 25 2019

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF  
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

Nos. 19-90000, 19-90001,  
19-90002, 19-90003, 19-90004,  
19-90005, 19-90006, 19-90007,  
19-90008, 19-90009, 19-90010,  
19-90011, 19-90012, 19-90013,  
19-90014, 19-90015, 19-90016,  
19-90017, 19-90018 and 19-90019

**ORDER**

**THOMAS**, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se prisoner, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against six circuit judges, nine district judges, and three magistrate judges.

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.

Over a number of years, complainant has filed or attempted to file hundreds of civil actions and appeals in various courts of this Circuit. As a result, complainant is barred by court order from filing certain actions unless accompanied by a filing fee, and has had numerous civil actions and appeals dismissed sua sponte. Complainant alleges that these rulings show that the subject judges have a "conflict of interest" with the First Amendment, have an "injudicious temperament," are in contempt of Congress, and suffer from various disabilities, including drug addiction, senility, physical and mental illness, and poor eyesight. However, adverse rulings are not evidence of misconduct or disability, and complainant provides no evidence in support of these vague and conclusory allegations, which are 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); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainant is advised that any future complaints raising similar, unfounded allegations will be summarily dismissed, and an order to show cause as to why complainant should not be restricted from filing further misconduct complaints will issue.

**DISMISSED.**