JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

JCP No. 08-24-90043

In re Complaint of John Doe*

This is a judicial complaint filed by a plaintiff against the district judge who dismissed his civil rights case.

In his civil case, the complainant argued that placement on the Iowa sex offender registry violated his rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The complainant argued for a constitutional right to refuse secular-based treatment and to opt for faith-based treatment suited to his personal beliefs. The judge dismissed the case without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction. While the complainant's appeal was pending, he filed a motion to reconsider in the district court "to address an issue not considered by [the district] court, but [that] was introduced as a theory in the appellate court." The judge denied the motion.

The judicial complaint alleges that the complainant "attempted . . . to bring the following information to the district court" in his motion to reconsider "to no avail." The complaint then presents a lengthy discussion of faith-based treatment programs and various ways that either secular or generic faith-based treatment programs might violate the complainant's constitutional rights. The complaint makes no further allegations about the judge.

^{*}Under Rule 24(a) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, the names of the complainant and the subject judge are not disclosed. Citations or references herein to a "Rule" refer to these Rules.

The judicial complaint must be dismissed as "directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling" because it simply challenges the judge's dismissal of the action and denial of the motion to reconsider. 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); see Rule 4(b)(1) (misconduct does not include "an allegation that calls into question the correctness of a judge's ruling").

For this reason, the judicial complaint is dismissed.

/s/ Steven M. Colloton Chief Judge

Filed: September 19, 2024