

**FILED**

SEPT 29 2022

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF  
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 21-90022

**ORDER**

**MURGUIA**, 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 her case and denied her request for a new judge because he is biased against complainant. This allegation directly relates to the merits of the case and must be dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) (listing reasons the chief judge may decide to dismiss the complaint, including claims directly related to the merits of a decision); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

To the extent complainant requests a new judge be assigned to her case, a litigant has “no right to any particular procedure for the selection of the judge, so long as the judge is chosen in a manner free from bias or the desire to influence the outcome of the proceedings.” In re Charge of Judicial Misconduct, 650 F.3d 1370, 1371 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Because there is no evidence of improper motive in the selection of the judge, this allegation must be dismissed.

**DISMISSED.**