

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

J.C. No. 03-18-90060

---

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT  
OR DISABILITY

---

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

---

MEMORANDUM OPINION

---

(Filed: May 21, 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 (the “Subject Judge”). 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 filed a pro se petition for a writ of mandamus naming a state court judge. The matter was assigned to the Subject Judge. A Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation recommending that the petition be dismissed as frivolous, for failure

to state a claim, and for lack of jurisdiction. Complainant filed objections and a motion for the Magistrate Judge's recusal. The Magistrate Judge declined to recuse. The Subject Judge adopted the report and recommendation as the opinion of the District Court and dismissed the petition with prejudice. Complainant did not appeal.

In this complaint of judicial misconduct, Complainant alleges that the Subject Judge "fraudulently and perjurally answered the complaint as if he was the defendant" and argues that a default judgment should have been entered against the defendant. Complainant contends that the Subject Judge's decision violates various state criminal perjury statutes as well as the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and that it constitutes conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the Courts.

"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*. The allegations of this complaint are largely merits-related, as they reflect an attempt to collaterally challenge the Subject Judge's decision to dismiss the petition for a writ of mandamus. 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*.

Although it is unclear why Complainant did not choose to appeal the dismissal of his petition for a writ of mandamus, this administrative proceeding cannot serve as a

substitute for filing an appeal. 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.” *See 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, the allegations challenging the Subject Judge’s decision are not cognizable and are therefore subject to dismissal.

When considered apart from the merits-related allegations, it is apparent that Complainant’s claims of criminal perjury, “fraud on the court,” and similar wrongdoing are entirely baseless. The record reveals no evidence raising an inference that the Subject Judge has engaged in criminal or unethical activity, or in any form of judicial misconduct whatsoever. Complainant’s remaining allegations are therefore 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. No. 03-18-90060

---

IN RE: COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT  
OR DISABILITY

---

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

---

ORDER

---

(Filed: May 21, 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](http://www.ca3.uscourts.gov).

s/ D. Brooks Smith  
Chief Judge

Dated: May 21, 2018