

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE
TENTH CIRCUIT**

IN RE: CHARGE OF JUDICIAL
MISCONDUCT

No. 10-10-90019

Before **BRISCOE**, Chief Judge.

ORDER

Complainant has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a district judge in this circuit. My consideration of this complaint is governed by 1) the misconduct rules issued by the Judicial Conference of the United States, entitled *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings* (the “Misconduct Rules”); 2) the federal statute dealing with judicial misconduct, 28 U.S.C. § 351 *et seq.*, and 3) the “Breyer Report,” a study by the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act Study Committee, headed by Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer, entitled *Implementation of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980*. The Breyer Report may be found at: <http://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/breyercommitteereport.pdf>. To the extent that there are any relevant prior decisions of the full Judicial Council of this circuit which are consistent with those authorities, they may also govern my consideration of this complaint.

Complainant has been provided with a copy of the Misconduct Rules, and the Rules are also accessible on the Tenth Circuit’s web page at:

<http://www.ca10.uscourts.gov/misconduct.php>. In accord with those rules, the names of the complainant and subject judge shall not be disclosed in this order. *See* Misconduct Rule 11(g)(2).

The complaint focuses primarily on the subject judge's rulings in an underlying case. To the extent that complainant takes issue with the rulings themselves, these claims are not cognizable as misconduct because they are "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling." Misconduct Rule 11(c)(1)(B). As explained in the Breyer Report, this exclusion of matters related to the merits of underlying cases protects the independence of the judges deciding those cases. *See* Breyer Report, App. E., ¶ 2.

Complainant also sets out general allegations of bias against the subject judge, based on the judge's rulings and language contained therein. While such allegations can state a valid claim for misconduct even when related to a judge's ruling, *see* Commentary to Misconduct Rule 3, this claim fails because it is completely unsupported. I have reviewed the court's rulings in the underlying case and find no language which would factually support complainant's allegations. The Misconduct Rules require complainants to support their allegations with "sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." *See* Misconduct Rule 11(c)(1)(D).

Finally, complainant contends that the subject judge delayed for over two and a half years in ruling on the underlying case. Delay can form the basis of a

misconduct claim, but only where “the allegation concerns an improper motive in delaying a particular decision or habitual delay in a significant number of cases.” Complainant neither alleges nor factually demonstrates either of these circumstances.

Accordingly, this complaint is dismissed pursuant to Misconduct Rule 11(c). The Circuit Executive is directed to transmit this order to complainant and copies to the subject judge and the Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. *See* Misconduct Rule 11(g)(2). To seek review of this order, complainant must file a petition for review by the Judicial Council. The requirements for filing a petition for review are set out in Misconduct Rule 18(b). The petition must be filed with the Office of the Circuit Executive within 35 days of the date of the letter transmitting this order. *Id.*

So ordered this 27th day of July, 2010.

/s/ Mary Beck Briscoe

Honorable Mary Beck Briscoe
Chief Circuit Judge