

25-90117-jm, 25-90118-jm, 25-90119-jm, 25-90120-jm
January 20, 2026
Acting Chief Judge & Judicial Council

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE
SECOND CIRCUIT**

-----X

In re

CHARGES OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

Docket Nos. 25-90117-jm
25-90118-jm
25-90119-jm
25-90120-jm

-----X

Before the Judicial Council of the Second Circuit:*

This order is issued, in part, by the Judicial Council of the Second Circuit, acting pursuant to Rule 10(a) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings (the “Rules”), and, in remaining part, by Acting Chief Circuit Judge Richard J. Sullivan pursuant to Rules 11 & 25(f).

Rule 10(a) authorizes the Council to sanction an abusive complainant. It provides in full:

A complainant who has filed repetitive, harassing, or frivolous complaints, or has otherwise abused the complaint procedure, may

* Chief Judge Debra A. Livingston and Judge Raymond J. Lohier, Jr., took no part in the consideration of this matter.

be restricted from filing further complaints. After giving the complainant an opportunity to show cause in writing why his or her right to file further complaints should not be limited, the judicial council may prohibit, restrict, or impose conditions on the complainant's use of the complaint procedure. Upon written request of the complainant, the judicial council may revise or withdraw any prohibition, restriction, or condition previously imposed.

On November 20, 2025, the Complainant was “ordered to show cause . . . why his right to file further complaints should not be limited.” This order was prompted by the Complainant's pattern of filing repetitive and frivolous judicial misconduct complaints. In the last year—i.e., prior to the filing of the current four complaints—the Complainant filed at least 7 frivolous misconduct complaints, alleging that various judges are part of a conspiracy against him, have committed criminal offenses, and are “part of an organized terrorist group.” The complaints were dismissed as frivolous, and the Complainant was warned that further abuse of the judicial misconduct complaint process may result in the imposition of sanctions or conditions on its use. He responded two days later by filing the four current complaints (25-90117-jm, 25-90118-jm, 25-90119-jm, 25-90120-jm), which make similar conspiratorial allegations. They are dismissed herein by the Acting Chief Circuit Judge as set forth further below.

On November 30 and December 2, 2025, the Complainant filed two

responses to the order to show cause. He argues generally that he has a duty to report misconduct and that it would be inappropriate to restrict him from doing so. Apart from that, the responses are frivolous, mostly consisting of additional conspiratorial claims and details about events that occurred years ago, with no obvious relevance to the pending complaints. Accordingly, the Complainant “demonstrates no awareness of the frivolous and vexatious nature of his prior complaints.” *In re Sassower*, 20 F.3d 42, 43–44 (2d Cir. Jud. Council 1994). These circumstances reveal a “likelihood that such abuse of the complaint procedure will continue unless some protective procedures are instituted.” *Id.* at 44.

Complainants who abuse the judicial complaint procedure may be restricted in their opportunity to initiate new misconduct complaints. Rule 10(a); *In re Sassower*, 20 F.3d at 44. A “‘leave to file’ requirement, foreclosing the filing and normal processing of a misconduct complaint unless leave to file has first been obtained . . . is the appropriate first level of sanction to be imposed on a person who abuses the misconduct procedure by filing a series of frivolous and vexatious complaints. The integrity of the misconduct complaint procedure, a matter of importance to all persons with a legitimate basis for making a complaint within the scope of [28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364], will best be maintained by

imposing a 'leave to file restriction' on those who abuse this procedure." *In re Sassower*, 20 F.3d at 44.

We conclude now that the Complainant's pattern of repetitive, harassing, and frivolous misconduct complaints merits the imposition of a leave-to-file requirement. As in *Sassower*, the Complainant's complaints repeatedly have been dismissed as baseless.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the Complainant shall not file in the Second Circuit any subsequent judicial misconduct complaints without first obtaining leave to file. The Clerk is directed to return to the Complainant, unfiled, any judicial misconduct complaint or document related thereto submitted by the Complainant that is not accompanied by an application seeking leave to file. If leave to file is granted, the complaint shall be filed and processed in the normal course; if leave to file is denied, the complaint shall be returned to the Complainant unfiled, in which event the Clerk shall maintain an appropriate record of the receipt and return of the complaints.

It is further ORDERED by the Acting Chief Circuit Judge that the outstanding misconduct complaints in 25-90117-jm, 25-90118-jm, 25-90119-jm, and 25-90120-jm, which allege, among other things, that the subject judges are

conspiring with “the grand wizard world wide of the white supremacy terrorist organization,” are dismissed as “lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred,” Rule 11(c)(1)(D), and as frivolous, Rule 11(c)(1)(C); *see also* Rule 11 cmt. (explaining that dismissal is appropriate “when the allegations are facially incredible or so lacking in indicia of reliability that no further inquiry is warranted”).

The Clerk is directed to transmit a copy of this order to the Complainant and to the judges who are the subjects of complaints 25-90117-jm, 25-90118-jm, 25-90119-jm, and 25-90120-jm.