

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

JCP No. 08-25-90026

JCP No. 08-25-90027

In re Complaint of John Doe*

This is a complaint of judicial misconduct by a former inmate against a district judge who was initially assigned to his *pro se* civil rights action, and a district judge who was next assigned to the action.

The complainant alleges that the judges have interfered with his access to the courts. The complaint alleges that the lawsuit has been pending for over a year, he wrote a letter to the second judge asking why his case was not allowed to proceed, and the judge did not respond. The complainant alleges that “the court has a personal interest in the outcome of the lawsuit,” and he would like a change of venue “because it appears . . . that there is some personal stuff against [him] going on.” The complainant does not explain the court’s alleged personal interest or alleged bias against him. The complainant notes that a different lawsuit filed by him was adjudicated more quickly.

The record shows that on April 15, 2024, the complainant filed a civil rights complaint against several defendants, including case managers, case workers, evidence custodians, the state department of corrections, and the parole board. On January 2, 2025, he filed an amended complaint adding a flooring contractor as a new

*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.

defendant. The same day, the case was reassigned from the previous judge to the current judge. The new defendant was added to the case. On May 7, 2025, the complainant filed a motion for “change of jurisdiction.” The district judge denied the motion on August 8, 2025. On the same date, because the case proceeded to service of process, the case was removed from the district court’s pro se docket and reassigned to a third district judge.

The complainant’s speculation that the subject judges had an improper motive or were biased against him is insufficient to raise an inference of judicial misconduct. *See* Rule 11(c)(1)(D). The alleged delay does not constitute cognizable misconduct because the complainant does not specify any improper motive in his case or habitual delay in a significant number of unrelated cases. *See* Rule 4(b)(2).

For these reasons, the judicial complaint is dismissed.

/s/ Steven M. Colloton
Chief Judge

Filed: October 14, 2025
