

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. 23-90145

ORDER

MURGUIA, Chief Judge:

Complainants, pro se litigants, have 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.

Complainants allege that the district told many lies under oath; however, the substance of the alleged lies concerned evidence and the applicable law. As such, this allegation relates directly to the merits of the judge's decisions and must be dismissed. 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 allegations that a district judge and a magistrate judge made various improper rulings in a civil case as relating to the merits); Judicial-Conduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B).

Complainants next allege that the district judge "held the case" and failed to rule on motions. 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). The record reflects that this case proceeded in due course and without substantive delay. Because there is no indication of misconduct by the district judge, the

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 frivolous or 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).

Because the record demonstrates that all motions were resolved when the case was dismissed, this allegation is also dismissed as unfounded. See id.

DISMISSED.