

**FILED**

MAY 6 2020

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF  
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 20-90022

**ORDER**

**THOMAS**, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a district court 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 should have allowed him more time to file a supplemental complaint and taken unspecified steps to allow complainant more opportunity to file pleadings in his civil rights action when he was simultaneously defending himself against criminal charges in state court. 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). Complainant speculates that the judge conspired with his adversary to use the criminal case to sabotage the civil rights action. Adverse rulings are not proof of misconduct or bias, and complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support 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, 715 F.3d 747, 749 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2013) ("As we have

frequently held, adverse rulings, standing alone, are not proof of misconduct”);  
Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

To the extent complainant raises allegations against the United States Marshals Service and other court personnel that made his ability to juggle the two cases difficult, such allegations are dismissed because this misconduct complaint procedure applies only to federal judges. See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 632 F.3d 1287, 1288 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011); Judicial-Conduct Rule 4.

**DISMISSED.**