

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

FILED

OCT 7 2025

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

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 25-90086

ORDER

MURGUIA, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a district judge and a magistrate 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 name of complainant and the subject judges 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 judges committed misconduct by improperly denying a number of motions filed by complainant. These motions include, but are not limited to, complainant's applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP application"), motions to seal complainant's IFP application papers, motions to disqualify each judge, a motion to issue summons, and a motion for sanctions. Complainant also alleges that it was improper for the magistrate judge to request more financial information regarding his IFP application.

These allegations are dismissed because they relate directly to the merits of the judge's decisions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) (listing reasons the chief judge may decide to dismiss the complaint, including that claims are directly related to the merits of a decision); *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 838 F.3d 1030 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2016) (dismissing as merits-related allegations that a judge made various improper rulings in a case); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B); *see also* Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(1) ("Cognizable misconduct does

not include an allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge's ruling, including a failure to recuse.").

Complainant then alleges that the magistrate judge asked the district judge to take "revenge" against complainant, which resulted in the district judge denying complainant's motions. However, adverse rulings are not proof of bias, and complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support these baseless allegations, which are dismissed as unfounded. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii) (listing reasons the chief judge may decide to dismiss the complaint, including claims that are lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred); *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).

Finally, complainant alleges that the magistrate judge arrived late for a hearing regarding the complainant's IFP application, "got angry" at complainant, and failed to clear the courtroom and disconnect online participants as requested. A review of the docket reveals there is no transcript available regarding the hearing in question, and complainant has submitted no objectively verifiable evidence to support these allegations. Therefore, these allegations are also dismissed as

unfounded. *See id.*

DISMISSED.