

FILED

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

NOV 28 2025

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

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

Nos. 25-90105, 25-90106

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 magistrate judge failed to correct the spelling of his first name on an order and that the magistrate judge failed to sufficiently explain why. A review of the record indicates the magistrate judge issued an order noting the error and the correct spelling of complainant's first name. To the extent complainant is arguing that the magistrate judge should have reissued the order in question, and that the magistrate judge was required to offer a more detailed explanation, such allegations are dismissed as merits related. *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).

Complainant also alleges that the magistrate judge's actions demonstrate retaliatory intent against him and indicate that the magistrate judge is suffering

from poor eyesight. Complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support these baseless allegations, beyond disagreeing with the judge's decisions. Therefore, these allegations 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).

Complainant named a district judge in his complaint but failed to provide any allegations regarding the district judge’s alleged misconduct. Accordingly, the complaint against the district judge is dismissed.

DISMISSED.