U. S. COURT OF APPEALS FILED

AUG 0 1 2017

FIFTH CIRCUIT LYLE W. CAYCE, CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Docket Number: 05-17-90074

## MEMORANDUM

Complainant, a *pro se* litigant, has filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject United States District Judge regarding three civil proceedings. Complainant alleges that the judge "broke my Civil Rights Title, Con[s]titution[al] Rights, and Federal Privacy Rights" by "ma[king] my information public ... anyone can pull up this information about me." The undersigned construes this as an allegation that the judge has not granted complainant's numerous informal requests to "remove" her cases from PACER.

Complainant further complains that despite "try[ing] my best to explain what is going on, [the judge] always sanction[s] me."

These allegations relate directly to the merits of the judge's decisions, and are therefore subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii).

Judicial misconduct proceedings are not a substitute for the normal appellate review process, nor may they be used to obtain reversal of a decision or a new trial.

An order dismissing the complaint is entered simultaneously herewith.

Carl E. Stewart

Chief Judge

July 39 , 2017

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FILED

SEP 26 2017

## BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

FIFTH CIRCUIT LYLE W. CAYCE, CLERK

No. 05-17-90074

Petition for Review by of the Final Order Filed August 1, 2017 Dismissing Judicial Misconduct Complaint Against

Under the Judicial Improvements Act of 2002.

## ORDER

An Appellate Review Panel of the Judicial Council for the Fifth Circuit has
reviewed the above-captioned petition for review, and all the members of the Panel have
voted to affirm the order of Chief Judge Stewart, filed August 1, 2017, dismissing the
Complaint of against against against against
, under the Judicial Improvements Act of 2002.

The Order is therefore

AFFIRMED.

9-21-2017

Priscilla R. Owen

United States Circuit Judge

For the Judicial Council of the Fifth Circuit