

FILED

AUG 20 2020

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 20-90053

ORDER

THOMAS, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has 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.

Complainant alleges that the district judge improperly dismissed a motion for change of judge and venue because the district judge is biased against him. These allegations are merits-related 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 alleges that the district judge is biased against him because the district judge presided over and dismissed another case that complainant was involved in. This unsupported allegation lacks sufficient evidence to raise an inference of bias and is dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 650 F.3d 1370, 1372 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011) (rejecting complainant's "invitation for the Judicial Council to conduct a fishing expedition" and explaining that "vague accusations and convoluted demands don't satisfy complainant's obligation to provide objective evidence of misconduct"); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 569 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009) ("complainant's vague insinuations do not

provide the kind of objectively verifiable proof that we require”);

Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Further, complainant alleges the district judge exhibited “clear bias” by asking complainant to electronically file his documents but continued to send complainant paper copies of documents. The docket reveals the court encouraged complainant to take advantage of receiving immediate notice of public documents filed in his case by requesting notices of filing electronically. Indeed, it appears the court issues this advisement to all pro se litigants and this notice was not targeted toward complainant. It is not entirely clear why complainant believes that this recommendation by the court exhibits bias. This allegation is dismissed for failure to allege misconduct. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); 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).

DISMISSED.