

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

---

JCP No. 08-25-90051

---

In re Complaint of John Doe<sup>\*</sup>

---

This is a complaint of judicial misconduct by a pro se debtor against a bankruptcy judge who presided in his case.

The complainant alleges that (1) the judge should have granted his motion for disability accommodations in the form of extra time due to “cognitive and physical impairments from a heart attack and clinical death,” (2) the judge improperly granted relief from the automatic stay to a creditor regarding real property, and (3) the judge’s actions “suggest bias or neglect” because she redacted court orders without justification, misapplied a procedural rule, and failed to scrutinize the creditor’s claim. The complaint also alleges failures by the bankruptcy trustee.

In the underlying case, the complainant filed a voluntary petition for bankruptcy. About a month later, he filed a motion requesting an extra 30 days for each deadline or task to accommodate his disabilities. The judge scheduled a hearing on the motion and on a motion regarding the real property. About five weeks later, the judge held a hearing and denied the complainant’s motion for accommodations for the reasons stated on the record. No transcript is available. The judge also granted the creditor’s motion for relief from a stay regarding real property.

---

<sup>\*</sup>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 complaint, citing statutes and court decisions, challenges the correctness of the judge's decisions. The complaint does not allege intentional discrimination based on disability. The complaint is thus 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 complaint is otherwise dismissed as "based on allegations lacking sufficient evidence to raise an inference that misconduct has occurred." Rule 11(c)(1)(D). The complaint's allegation that the judge's actions "suggest bias" is unsupported and speculative.

The complaint's allegations about the trustee are not cognizable in these judicial conduct proceedings. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 351 (a) (providing for complaints against judges), (b) (defining "judge"); Rule 1 (judicial conduct rules apply to covered judges).

For these reasons, the judicial complaint is dismissed.

/s/ Steven M. Colloton  
Chief Judge

Filed: November 7, 2025

---