

JUN 20 2019

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

No. 19-90064

ORDER**THOMAS**, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, 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 has not yet ruled on his application to proceed in forma pauperis. However, complainant fails to show or allege that any delay is based on an improper motive, or that the judge has habitually delayed ruling in a significant number of unrelated cases. Accordingly, this charge must be dismissed. See Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 584 F.3d 1230, 1231 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009).

Complainant also alleges that the judge is “biased against plaintiff rights.” However, adverse rulings (or an absence of rulings) are not evidence of bias, and complainant offers no other evidence to support this allegation, which must be 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) (“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”); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

DISMISSED.