FILED

JUDICIAL COUNCIL

OCT 19 2020

OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

IN RE COMPLAINT OF

JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

Nos. 20-90054 and 20-90055

ORDER

THOMAS, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against two magistrate judges. 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 two magistrate judges misinterpreted a state statute in three cases. Complainant was not a party in any of these cases, however, he believes that his requests for appeal have been denied because of the magistrate judges' misinterpretation of the law in those three cases. Apart from stating that the magistrate judges misinterpreted a statute, complaint provides no evidence to support his allegations. Further, these allegations are directly related to the merits 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).

DISMISSED.