

FILED

MAR 4 2026

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 25-90151

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 the 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 filed a civil complaint alleging fraud against a mortgage lender. The district judge conducted an evidentiary hearing related to the fraud allegations. Complainant alleges that the judge's handling of the evidentiary hearing constitutes judicial misconduct in a number of ways, including that the judge (1) "overlooked" exhibits, "disregarded" alibi evidence, and "failed to address or resolve credibility issues"; (2) credited a witness' testimony despite irregularities; (3) relied on copies of documents and did not order the production of certain documents; and (4) "misapplied" certain legal standards. However, a review of the record reveals that the judge heard testimony from complainant and complainant's witnesses and carefully evaluated the evidence, before concluding that complainant had failed to meet his burden. Any allegation that the judge "overlooked," "disregarded," or "failed to address" evidence is denied as belied by the record.

The remaining allegations challenge the judge's evaluations regarding credibility and admissibility of evidence, and the relevant legal standards. "Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or

procedural ruling of a judge — without more — is merits-related. The phrase ‘decision or procedural ruling’ is not limited to rulings issued in deciding Article III cases or controversies.” *See* Commentary on Rule 4. Accordingly, these allegations are dismissed because they seek to challenge 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 or procedural ruling); *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).

Finally, complainant alleges that the judge’s “actions collectively demonstrate a pattern” of bias or discrimination. However, adverse rulings are not proof of bias. *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 650 F.3d 1370, 1371 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2011). Because complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support these allegations, they 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).

DISMISSED.