

Complainant also filed this judicial complaint alleging that the district judge:

- improperly accepted the magistrate judge's recommendation because her recommendations were based on political interference and conspiracy with a state court judge;
- conspired with the magistrate judge and the state court judge to keep complainant falsely imprisoned;
- exhibited personal bias against complainant; and
- denied complainant access to the courts.

Complainant seeks recusal of the district judge from all of his cases and reinstatement of his previously dismissed cases.


The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act provides a means to review claims relating to a judge's conduct; it does not permit review of a judge's decisions. Allegations that are "[d]irectly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling" cannot be raised through a judicial misconduct complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii). The judicial complaint procedures permit review of a claim that a judicial decision is "the result of an improper motive, e.g., a bribe, ex parte contact, racial or ethnic bias," but only to the extent of challenging the improper motive as opposed to the decision itself. Rule 3(h)(3)(A), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. Such

a charge must be supported by "sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii).

Complainant has presented no evidence of illegal bias or prejudice or of a conspiracy between the district judge and the magistrate judge and state court judge. His disagreement with the judge's rulings cannot be challenged through the judicial misconduct procedure. See In re Doe, 640 F.3d 869, 873 (8th Cir. 2011) ("Although allegations of judicial bias, collusion with a party, or other improper motive are not necessarily merits-related, such allegations must be dismissed as merits-related when the only support for the allegation of bad acts or motive is the merits of the judge's rulings . . .").

This judicial complaint is, accordingly, dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii) & (iii) as related to the merits of the judge's rulings and lacking in factual support.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


William B. Traxler, Jr.
Chief Judge