

The Judicial Council

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

In the Matter of

Judicial Council Complaint No. DC-11-90004

A Charge of Judicial Misconduct or Disability


Before: SENTELLE, Chief Judge of the Circuit

ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaint herein and the supplement thereto, filed against a Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia pursuant to the Judicial Councils Reform and Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 and the Judicial Conference of the United States Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, it is

ORDERED, for the reasons stated in the attached Memorandum, that the complaint be dismissed. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 11(c)(1)(B).

The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order and accompanying Memorandum to complainant, the subject judge, and the Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b); JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 11(g)(2).



David B. Sentelle, Chief Judge
District of Columbia Circuit

Date: _____

4/15/11

MEMORANDUM

Complainant alleges that a judge from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts. Specifically, complainant appears to be alleging that the subject judge failed to file documents by improperly denying complainant leave to file several pleadings. Complainant's allegation, however, does not provide any grounds for action against the subject judge.

Complainant alleges that the subject judge committed "ministerial" errors by improperly denying complainant leave to file certain pleadings in complainant's underlying case. Those allegations, however, are direct challenges to the merits of the subject judge's rulings. The appropriate avenue to obtain relief from alleged erroneous rulings, however, is not a judicial misconduct proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) (providing for dismissal of a complaint that is "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling"); JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 11(c)(1)(B) ("A complaint must be dismissed in whole or in part to the extent that the chief judge concludes that the complaint . . . is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling."). Complainant has indicated an intention to file a notice of appeal and a Rule 60(b) motion where challenges to the orders denying leave to file can be made.

Thus, because the allegation is directly related to the merits of the subject judge's rulings, the complaint must be dismissed.¹

¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(c) and JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL -DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS 18(a), complainant may file a petition for review by the Judicial Council for the District of Columbia Circuit. Any petition must be filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Court of Appeals within 35 days of the date of the Clerk's letter transmitting the dismissal Order and this Memorandum. *Id.* R. 18(b).