

FILED

MAY 24 2024

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

Nos. 23-90075 and 23-90076

ORDER

MURGUIA, Chief Judge:

Complainant, a pro se prisoner, 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 names 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 claims that both judges committed misconduct by not ruling on his motions to strike filing fees. However, the record indicates that both motions were denied, and that complainant was given notice as to the denials in August 2023. Thus, this allegation is dismissed as unfounded. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

To the extent complainant is alleging improper delay by both judges, the record refutes this allegation, and without a showing of an “improper motive in delaying a particular decision or a habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases,” delay alone is not cognizable misconduct. See Judicial-Conduct Rule 4(b)(2). Because there is no indication of misconduct by either judge, the allegation is dismissed as unfounded. Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

DISMISSED.