

**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. 25-90126

ORDER

MURGUIA, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against 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 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 magistrate judge committed misconduct by ignoring him during a case management conference on July 8, 2025. Complainant believes the magistrate judge ignored him because he is a pro se litigant. However, complainant has submitted no objectively verifiable evidence supporting this allegation. Furthermore, a review of the docket indicates no transcript of the proceedings that day is available, and that the case management conference, originally scheduled for July 8, 2025, was vacated by the court on June 30, 2025.

Therefore, this allegation is 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); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

DISMISSED.