

FEB 18 2024

JARRETT B. PERLOW
CLERK OF COURT

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

IN RE COMPLAINT NOS. FC-25-90001, FC-25-90002,
FC-25-90003, FC-25-90004, FC-25-90005, FC-25-90006,
FC-25-90007, FC-25-90008, FC-25-90009, FC-25-90010,
FC-25-90011, FC-25-90012, FC-25-90013, AND FC-25-
90014

Before MOORE, *Chief Judge*.

ORDER AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

The complainant previously filed complaints at this court (Nos. FC-22-90024 through FC-22-90037) against the two judges of the United States Court of Federal Claims and twelve judges of this court who were involved in two of his prior cases. Those complaints were dismissed because the allegations against the judges of this court were frivolous and unsupported and because the complaints against the trial judges were filed in the wrong court.

The complainant has now filed new complaints against “ALL Judicial Officers” involved in the same two appeals and two additional appeals filed after the dismissal of his last complaint.¹ Because I am one of the judges, I would ordinarily recuse from ruling on the matter. However, as

¹ To the extent the complainant asserts wrongdoing by other individuals not covered by the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, the court does not accept any complaint against those individuals. See Rule 8(d).

previously, where, as here, all regular active circuit judges are disqualified, the court may “determine whether to request a transfer [to another circuit] under Rule 26, or, in the interest of sound judicial administration, to permit the chief judge to dispose of the complaint on the merits.” Rule 25(f). Pursuant to that rule, the court has directed me to decide the merits of these consolidated complaints.

These complaints must also be dismissed. I previously explained that complainant’s prior allegation that this court’s judges committed judicial misconduct by issuing *Per Curiam* rulings was frivolous because the action was entirely consistent with our Internal Operating Procedures.² Nonetheless, complainant now again relies on the same meritless ground for misconduct (“Orders were issued *Per Curiam* intentionally and maliciously to mislead justice[.]”), while raising baseless attacks of “fraud,” “deprivation of rights,” “treason,” “bias[] and prejudice[],” “retaliat[ion],” “obstruct[ion of] justice,” and “illegally and intentionally ignor[ing] evidence exposing the serious intentional corruption, crimes, and scandals.”

Because these largely duplicative allegations are frivolous, lack any basis to raise an inference of misconduct, and directly relate to the judges’ rulings, they are dismissed. See Rule 11(c)(1)(B)–(D). The complainant is now warned that continued abuse of the judicial misconduct complaint process will likely result in the imposition of filing restrictions. See Rule 10(a) (“A complainant who has filed repetitive, harassing, or frivolous complaints, or has

² See Fed. Cir. IOP #9(5) (“At the election of the authoring judge, a unanimous or majority opinion, precedential or nonprecedential, may be headed ‘PER CURIAM.’”).

