

FILED

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

FEB 2 2026
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

Nos. 25-90246, 25-90247,
25-90248, 25-90249, 25-90250,
25-90251, 25-90252, 25-90253,
25-90254, 25-90255, 25-90256,
25-90257, 25-90258, 25-90259,
25-90260, 25-90261, 25-90262,
25-90263, 25-90264, 25-90265,
25-90266

ORDER

MURGUIA, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against ten district judges and eleven circuit judges. 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 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.

In 2010, complainant was found to be a vexatious litigant by a district court. A prefiling order was imposed against him, which he has been arguing is “fraudulent” ever since. Complainant alleges that each of the subject judges “conspired” with a district judge (not named in this complaint) by relying on the prefiling order.

This allegation is dismissed because it relates directly to the merits of the judges’ 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).

Further, because complainant provides no objectively verifiable evidence to support his allegation of a conspiracy, it is also 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, the allegation is dismissed because complainant previously made this same allegation against many of the same subject judges. *See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, No. 10-90023 (9th Cir. C.J. Nov. 16, 2010) (summarily dismissing a complaint where a complainant previously filed two materially identical complaints against the same judge).

Prior to the instant complaint, complainant has filed seven materially identical misconduct complaints against 22 judges since 2020. *See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, Nos. 25-90232, 25-90021+, 25-90046+, 25-90051, 24-90130, 23-90003+, 20-90130+. All seven of these previous complaints were related to the 2010 prefilings order and were dismissed as merits-related or unfounded.

Complainant has now filed eight misconduct complaints against a total of 23

judges, raising allegations that have been dismissed as merits-related and unfounded. In a previous order filed June 9, 2025, complainant was cautioned that repetitive, harassing, or frivolous complaints may result in complainant being restricted from filing further complaints. *See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, No. 25-90021+.

Accordingly, complainant is ordered to show cause why he should not be sanctioned by a restrictive filing order. *See* Judicial-Conduct Rule 10(a); *In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct*, 552 F.3d 1146, 1148 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2009) (ordering complainant to show cause why he should not be sanctioned after filing sixteen misconduct complaints that were dismissed as conclusory or merits related).

Complainant has thirty-five days from the filing of this order to file a response, which will be transmitted to the Judicial Council for its consideration.

DISMISSED and COMPLAINANT ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE.