

FILED

NOV 18 2019

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

Nos. 19-90135 and 19-90136

ORDER

THOMAS, Chief Judge:

Complainants, pro se litigants, have filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a district judge and 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 complainants 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.

Complainants allege that the magistrate judge has improperly entered rulings in the underlying case without jurisdiction. However, district judges may designate magistrate judges to hear and determine pretrial matters and issue non-dispositive orders. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Flam v. Flam, 788 F.3d 1043, 1046 (9th Cir. 2015). A review of the underlying docket reveals that the magistrate judge did not issue any dispositive orders in this case. Accordingly, this allegation is dismissed as unfounded and for failure to allege misconduct. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 647 F.3d 1181, 1182 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011) (“Because complainant doesn’t allege conduct ‘prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts,’ her charges must be dismissed”); Judicial-Conduct Rules 11(c)(1)(A), (D).

Complainants also allege that the district judge did not afford them “due process or equal justice under the law” in his management of the case. 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).

Complainants further allege that the judges are biased and retaliated against them because they filed claims against government officials. Adverse rulings are not proof of bias or conspiracy, and complainants provide no objectively verifiable evidence to support this allegation, which is dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 650 F.3d 1370, 1371 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011) (“adverse rulings do not prove bias or conspiracy”); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 583 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainants request that the chief district judge of the district where the subject judges preside be involved in reviewing these allegations of misconduct. However, the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act provides that the Chief Judge of the Circuit review and take action on complaints received, and thus this request is denied. See 28 U.S.C. § 352.

DISMISSED.