

FILED

AUG 1 2024

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

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**IN RE COMPLAINT OF
JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT**

No. 23-90144

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 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 district judge failed to provide him notice and an opportunity to respond. The record belies this allegation, including the assertion that the district judge granted defendant's requests "less than 4 hours after they were filed." Because no evidence supports this allegation, it 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); 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 next alleges that the district judge aided, abetted, and allowed the defendant's criminal and unauthorized practice of law. Again, this allegation is belied by the record, which reflects that the district judge raised this issue and required the pro se defendant to obtain counsel. This allegation is also dismissed as unfounded. See id.

Finally, complainant alleges that the district judge has demonstrated a “willful and intentional bias” against him, based on her rulings in this case and other cases. However, adverse rulings are not proof of bias. See In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct, 838 F.3d 1030 (9th Cir. Jud. Council 2016). Accordingly, this allegation is dismissed as unfounded and as an impermissible challenge to the merits of the judge’s decision. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii), (iii) (listing reasons the chief judge may decide to dismiss the complaint, including that claims are directly related to the merits of a decision, or that claims are lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B), (D).

DISMISSED.