Judicial Council for the Fifth Circuit

Complaint Numbers: 05-22-90053 and 05-22-90054

$\mathbf{M} \mathrel{\mathrm{E}} \mathbf{M} \mathrel{\mathrm{O}} \mathrel{\mathrm{R}} \mathrel{\mathrm{A}} \mathrel{\mathrm{N}} \mathrel{\mathrm{D}} \mathrel{\mathrm{U}} \mathrel{\mathrm{M}}$

Complainant, a pro se litigant, has filed a complaint alleging misconduct by the subject United States District Judge and the subject United States Magistrate Judge in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 proceeding.

Complainant appears to complain that because she did not consent to the transfer of her lawsuit from United States District Court A to United States District Court B, "there is no case. I want misconduct charges for falsifying a case.... When did I file this case in [United States District Court B]?" She asserts that the magistrate judge "thinks she can get away with her fake case because stupid US defense attorneys file fraudulent motions."

Complainant further complains that the judge—who, adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation, granted the defendants' motion to dismiss and dismissed complainant's claims with prejudice—"said he reviewed the case de novo. Does de novo include God because that is where it all started? In his "de novo" [sic] he has made himself an accomplice to [the magistrate judge's] fraud and everything that happened after that."

Complainant concludes that the judge and the magistrate judge "are liars" who "do illegal things and harass black people, then get self-righteous like you own the place, and keep going with your illegal activity like we are the problem.... Treason." To the extent that these allegations relate directly to the merits of decisions or procedural rulings, they are subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii). In other respects, any assertions of "falsification," racial animus, and treason appear entirely derivative of the merits-related charges, but to the extent the allegations are separate, they are wholly unsupported and are therefore subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(iii) as "lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred."

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.

This is complainant's fifth merits-related and conclusory complaint in less than seven months, and she has been warned previously against filing a further merits-related, conclusory, frivolous, or repetitive complaint. Complainant's right to file complaints is hereby SUSPENDED pursuant to Rule 10(a), Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. Complainant may show cause, through a petition for review submitted pursuant to Rule 18, why her right to file further complaints should not be so limited.

An order dismissing the complaint is entered simultaneously herewith.

<u>/s/ Priscilla Richman</u>

Priscilla Richman Chief United States Circuit Judge

May 18, 2022

Before the Judicial Council of the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit **FILED** June 28, 2022 Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

Complaint Numbers: 05-22-90053 and 05-22-90054

Petition for Review by					
of the Final Order Filed May 20, 2022,					
dismissing the Judicial Misconduct Complaint against					
and					

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 Priscilla Richman, filed May 20, 2022, dismissing the

Complaint	of		against	
		unde	er the Judi	cial Improvements Act
-60000				

of 2002.

The Order is therefore **AFFIRMED IN ALL RESPECTS**.

<u>fune 23, 202</u>2 Date

Jennifer W. Errod United States Circuit Judge For the Judicial Council of the Fifth Circuit