

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

---

JCP No. 08-24-90113

JCP No. 08-24-90114

JCP No. 08-24-90115

JCP No. 08-24-90117

---

In re Complaint of John Doe\*

---

These are complaints of judicial misconduct by a litigant in criminal and civil cases. The complaints are against the district judge and magistrate judge who are assigned to the criminal case, another magistrate judge who presided at the complainant's arraignment, and the magistrate judge who is assigned to the civil case.

The record shows that the complainant was charged by a grand jury with wire fraud, bankruptcy fraud, and money laundering. All of the judicial misconduct complaints allege that "this entire matter relates to [the complainant's] pre-trial detainment . . . since his initial appearance." The complainant asserts that he has been "politically persecuted and [is] a political prisoner," that he is "jailed as a pretrial detainee" because of his academic political writings, that the United States Attorney and "these Democrat judges have directly or by conspiracy jailed [him] to influence, obstruct, and defeat the 2024 election for President of the United States" and his civil lawsuit against the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and that the judicial district's "federal bench is corrupt with judges guilty of bias, impropriety, misconduct, and corruption."

---

\*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 complainant identifies supporting materials, which include: (1) his 13-page letter to the chief district judge raising misconduct claims about the four subject judges, (2) his motions for disqualification or recusal of the four judges, (3) his complaint and “notice of related case filing” in a civil case against the FBI, and (4) his “unedited, unpublished, rough draft academic writings, a Trumpian Republican book in the making, the [] Report . . . and the [] Report Part 2 . . . , both filed in [his] criminal case and the only reason that [he] was jailed.”

With respect to the magistrate judge who conducted the complainant’s arraignment, the complainant alleges that the judge ordered his detention in retaliation for his report.

Regarding the magistrate judge assigned to his criminal case, the complainant alleges that the judge “was clearly angry and screamed at [him] refusing to let [him] speak” about his report at his initial appearance, except through the court-appointed attorney. The complainant alleges that the judge “screamed” at him during a hearing on pretrial detention, “made many false, sensational, and retaliatory statements” against him in an order denying his motion for release from custody, and wrongly quashed his *pro se* motions seeking the judges’ recusal. In five supplements, the complainant challenges the judge’s refusal to recuse and submits letters and documents that he sent to United States Attorneys and others regarding his case and his efforts to gain release from jail. The complainant asserts that he is being prosecuted and detained because of his “rough draft Christian Trumpian Republican book.”

As for the district judge, the complainant alleges that pretrial detention orders “are retaliatory, discriminatory, actively conceal misconduct, obstruct the reporting of misconduct, and are riddled with bias and corruption as [the judge] attacks [the complainant’s] rough draft . . . and even tries to turn that book into a mental health issue.” The complainant states that the judge interfered with and obstructed the

judicial complaint process by attaching his judicial complaints to the detention order, and alleges that the judge used the letter sent to the chief judge as grounds for keeping him in jail. The complainant later filed April 30, 2025a supplement with a copy of a petition for a writ of mandamus that he filed to seek the judge's removal from his criminal case.

Regarding the magistrate judge assigned to the complainant's civil case, the complainant alleges that the judge is using her office to "throw cases and curry favor" with the United States Attorney to advance her career, and that she is "working with, for, and serving as a witness against [him]." In a supplement, the complainant submits a motion for correction of the docket filed in the civil case. The motion asserts there are errors on the civil docket regarding the type of action and amount of relief sought, and tells the court that the FBI attempted to assassinate him by attacking him with a fighter jet and helicopter, and by planting a rabid bat in the house where he slept.

The complainant concludes that the judges engaged in inappropriate *ex parte* communication with one another, engaged in partisan political activity by attacking the complainant's book, treated him in a demonstrably egregious and hostile manner, discriminated against him based on his political affiliation and speech, retaliated against him for making judicial misconduct complaints, and interfered with and obstructed the judicial complaint process.

The record shows that the government moved for the complainant's pretrial detention on the ground that there was a serious risk that he would threaten, injure, or intimidate a prospective witness, or attempt to do so. At the detention hearing, the government submitted evidence that, in response to the government's investigation, the complainant sent his two reports to federal officials. The magistrate judge found that the reports contained "intimidating and threatening rhetoric directed at specific individuals involved in some manner in [the complainant's] federal case," including

witnesses against him. The magistrate judge ruled that detention was warranted and cited serious concerns about the complainant's "impulsiveness and mental health" in light of the reports.

The district judge overruled the complainant's objections to the magistrate judge's detention order. The judge found that the complainant's reports referred to five people involved in the investigation, and called for the execution and death penalty of officials of the federal government, including witnesses against him. The judge concluded that the reports contained threats that went beyond the mere threat of legal process. The complainant sent part two of his report to federal officials the night before he was to self-surrender. The document repeatedly stated that the United States Attorney should be "executed," and said the complainant's "personal preference is public hanging, even nationally televised hanging, but lethal injection may now be the only method used." The complainant's report also stated: "A sacrifice must be made. The price must be paid. I am Justice." The complainant added that his "departure from the generosity and leniency of [his] previous writings" was due to a "Divine Source."

After a mental health evaluation, the complainant moved for release from custody. The magistrate judge held a hearing but denied the complainant's motion for release. The district judge overruled the complainant's objections to the magistrate judge's order. Although the psychologist who diagnosed the complainant with a delusional disorder testified that she did not believe that he posed a risk of physical violence or aggression, the judge noted that the psychologist had not assessed the complainant's "risk of continuing to do what he did up until the night before his first appearance in court: write and publish focused, graphic, and violent suggestions that the United States Attorney, judges, FBI agents, and other people whom he perceives as enemies be killed."

The district judge stated that he had serious concerns that the complainant posed a threat to potential witnesses and to the judicial process as a whole given the content of the reports, the circumstances in which they were sent, and the escalation in the severity of his threats towards specific individuals since the indictment. The district judge agreed with the magistrate judge's conclusion that no condition or combination of conditions would reasonably assure the safety of the community should the complainant be released pending trial.

The magistrate judge later entered a text order stating that he would not consider the complainant's *pro se* motions as long as the complainant was represented by counsel. The complainant sought recusal of all four judges, and each judge declined to recuse.

The complainant strongly disagrees that his actions and writings justify pretrial detention in the criminal case, but a judicial misconduct proceeding is not the appropriate forum in which to litigate the merits of the detention order. Allegations about the judges' orders—including those regarding detention, recusal, and proceeding through counsel—are dismissed as “directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling.” 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii); Rule 11(c)(1)(B). The materials identified by the complainant do not raise an inference of judicial misconduct. No evidence supports an inference of bias, prejudice, conspiracy, political persecution, improper retaliation or discrimination, improper *ex parte* communications, or obstruction of the judicial complaint process. *See* Rule 11(c)(1)(C), (D). The complainant is entitled to seek appropriate appellate review of adverse decisions, but vigorous disagreement with judicial rulings does not support a claim of judicial misconduct.

For these reasons, the judicial complaints are dismissed.

/s/ Steven M. Colloton  
Chief Judge

Filed: May 1, 2025

---