

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

JCP No. 08-25-90090

In re Complaint of John Doe*

This is a complaint of judicial misconduct by a pro se plaintiff against a district judge who entered orders in her employment discrimination action.

The complainant alleges that a magistrate judge was assigned to the case, but “[f]or some biased reason, [the subject judge] stepped in without my knowledge and denied all motions when orders were in place by [the magistrate judge].” Citing a local rule of court, the complainant states that civil actions are assigned to judges by automated random selection, the cause number for each case includes the initials of the assigned judge, and the cause number must be modified to reflect the new judge’s initials if the case is reassigned.

The complainant filed an employment discrimination action in July 2025. A magistrate judge’s initials are part of the case number. The complainant filed several motions, and the magistrate judge entered some preliminary orders. In August 2025, the subject judge entered an order stating that although the complaint was subject to dismissal as written, he would allow the complainant to file an amended complaint. The order also provided instructions for filing an amended complaint, and denied the complainant’s emergency motion for a protective order and to enjoin the defendants from taking certain actions.

*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 filed a motion for transfer. She asserted that her case was assigned to the magistrate judge, and that the subject judge “unilaterally intervened and issued orders . . . despite lacking proper assignment or authority.” The subject judge denied the motion, explaining that a district judge was required to rule on the complainant’s motion requesting injunctive relief. Because the complainant had not filed an amended complaint as directed in the earlier order, the subject judge dismissed the case without prejudice.

The complaint is dismissed because it does not allege conduct that is prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts. *See* Rule 11(c)(1)(A). A district judge may designate a magistrate judge to determine certain pretrial matters, but not a motion for injunctive relief. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A).

To the extent that the complainant challenges the correctness of the subject judge’s orders, the complaint is 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). There is no supported allegation of bias by the subject judge.

For these reasons, the judicial complaint is dismissed.

/s/ Steven M. Colloton
Chief Judge

Filed: June 1, 2026
