

FILED

JAN 24 2020

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 19-90153

ORDER

THOMAS, Chief Judge:

Complainants, two pro se litigants, have 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 complainants allege that the judge improperly denied motions to intervene, approved a stipulation, or made other incorrect rulings in the underlying case, 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).

Complainants allege that the judge conspired to violate their constitutional rights and the rights of other property owners. However, adverse rulings are not proof of conspiracy or other misconduct, and complainants provide 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, 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).

DISMISSED.