

FILED

DEC 23 2020

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 20-90076

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 his civil case because of political motives. Complainant provides no evidence in support of his allegation that the district judge had political motives and a review of the docket reveals that the district judge dismissed complainant's case because complainant failed to allege a claim. Because this allegation is merits-related, it 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 next alleges that the district judge's standing order requirement for pre-filing conferences was imposed because the district judge wanted to provide the defendant with an opportunity to murder complainant. Complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support this speculative allegation, which is dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); 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).

DISMISSED.