

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

J.C. Nos. 03-17-90083, 03-17-90084

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT
OR DISABILITY

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 351

MEMORANDUM OPINION

(Filed: February 9, 2018)

PRESENT: SMITH, *Chief Judge*.

This is a complaint filed under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-64, against a United States District Judge (“Subject Judge I”) and a United States Magistrate Judge (“Subject Judge II”). For the reasons discussed below, the complaint will be dismissed.

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, after 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. 28 U.S.C. §§ 352(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iii).

Complainant, a state prisoner, filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The petition was assigned to Subject Judge I, who referred the matter to Subject Judge II for a report and recommendation. Subject Judge II recommended that the petition be dismissed with prejudice. Complainant objected. Subject Judge I considered Complainant's objections, adopted Subject Judge II's report and recommendation, denied and dismissed the habeas petition, and declined to issue a certificate of appealability. Complainant appealed, and the Court of Appeals declined to issue a certificate of appealability.

In this complaint of judicial misconduct, Complainant alleges that Subject Judges I and II engaged in judicial misconduct and that Subject Judge I suffers from a disability based upon his age. Complainant's allegations rest entirely upon the premise that his habeas petition had merit and that the Subject Judges erred in their determinations to the contrary. Indeed, this complaint of judicial misconduct presents the same allegations that were previously raised and rejected in the habeas proceeding.

Complainant's allegations are merits-related. "An allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge's ruling, . . . without more, is merits-related." Rule 3(h)(3)(A), *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings*. Merits-related allegations do not constitute cognizable misconduct under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Rules 3(h)(3)(A), 11(c)(1)(B), *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings*. Complainant sought review of the denial of his habeas petition by applying to the Court of Appeals for a certificate of

appealability. That application was denied, and this administrative forum does not provide Complainant an opportunity to re-litigate the issue. The “misconduct procedure [under the Act] is not designed as a substitute for, or supplement to, appeals or motions for reconsideration. Nor is it designed to provide an avenue for collateral attacks or other challenges to judges’ rulings.” *In re Memorandum of Decision of Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability*, 517 F.3d 558, 561 (U.S. Jud. Conf. 2008). Accordingly, Complainant’s merits-related allegations will be dismissed.

When considered apart from the merits-related allegations, it is apparent that Complainant’s claim that Subject Judge I suffers from an age-related disability is based upon mere speculation. The record provides no support for an inference that an age-related disability is present or that judicial misconduct has occurred. Accordingly, any remaining allegations are subject to dismissal as frivolous and unsupported by evidence that would raise an inference that misconduct has occurred. 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii); Rule 11(c)(1)(C), (D), *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings*.

Based on the foregoing, this complaint will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii).

s/ D. Brooks Smith

Chief Judge

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

J.C. Nos. 03-17-90083, 03-17-90084

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT
OR DISABILITY

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 351

ORDER

(Filed: February 9, 2018)

PRESENT: SMITH, *Chief Judge*.

On the basis of the foregoing opinion entered on this date, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the written complaint brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 351 is hereby dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) and (iii).

This order constitutes a final order under 28 U.S.C. § 352(c). Complainant is notified in accordance with Rules 11(g)(3) and 18, *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings*, of the right to appeal this decision by the following procedure:

Rule 18(a) Petition. A complainant or subject judge may petition the Judicial Council of the Third Circuit for review.

Rule 18(b) Time. A petition for review must be filed in the Office of the Circuit Executive within **42 days** after the date of the chief judge's order.

18(b) Form. The petition should be in letter form, addressed to the Circuit Executive, and in an envelope marked "Misconduct Petition" or "Disability

Petition.” The name of the subject judge must not be shown on the envelope. The letter should be typewritten or otherwise legible. It should begin with “I hereby petition the judicial council for review of . . .” and state the reasons why the petition should be granted. It must be signed. There is no need to enclose a copy of the original complaint.

The full text of the *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability*

Proceedings is available from the Office of the Circuit Executive and on the Court of

Appeals’ internet site, www.ca3.uscourts.gov.

s/ D. Brooks Smith

Chief Judge

Dated: February 9, 2018