

JUL 14 2022

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT****IN RE COMPLAINT OF  
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 21-90065

**ORDER****MURGUIA**, Chief Judge:

Complainants, pro se litigants, have 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 complainants and the subject judge[s] 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.

Complainants allege that the district judge improperly entered judgment against them in two civil actions, while making multiple incorrect rulings during these actions. Because this allegation relates directly to the merits of the judge's rulings, the complainants have not alleged facts that might amount to judicial misconduct, and therefore the charge 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); In re Charge of Judicial Misconduct, 685 F.2d 1226, 1227 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 1982) (Judicial Council found charges of judicial misconduct were properly dismissed by chief judge when, as here, "appellate review, not the procedures for judicial misconduct" was the proper remedy); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

Complainants argue the district judge was biased, based on allegations that the district judge personally prevented the issuance of summons in one case, that the district judge disrupted the random judge assignment process, and that the district judge improperly influenced the denial of their disqualification motions. However, adverse rulings are not proof of bias, and complainant provides no

objectively verifiable evidence to support these allegations, which are dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 650 F.3d 1370, 1371 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011) (“adverse rulings do not prove bias or conspiracy”); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 569 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009) (“claimant’s vague insinuations do not provide the kind of objectively verifiable proof that we require”); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Complainants also allege that the district judge improperly delayed rulings on certain motions in one of their cases. However, the record does not disclose any undue delay, and complainant offers no evidence that the alleged delay is based on improper motive, or that the district judge has habitually delayed ruling in a significant number of unrelated cases, and accordingly this charge must be dismissed. See Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2); In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 584 F.3d 1230, 1231 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009).

To the extent complainants request that the district judge be charged criminally or with contempt, such relief is not available in these misconduct complaint proceedings. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(a).

**DISMISSED.**