

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

APR 14 2016

FIFTH CIRCUIT  
LYLE W. CAYCE, CLERK

---

Complaint Numbers: 05-16-90062 through 05-16-90065

---

## M E M O R A N D U M

Complainant, a state prisoner, complains that the subject United States District Judge erroneously held that complainant's application for a writ of habeas corpus was a successive application and should be transferred to the Fifth Circuit. [REDACTED] appears to further assert that the three subject United States Circuit Judges should not have affirmed the district court's judgment, and by doing so "denied [me] due process, access to courts, equal protection to the laws, and knowingly and intentionally, illegally extended [my] uncharged punishments."

These allegations relate directly to the merits of the judges' decisions, and are therefore subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii).

Judicial misconduct proceedings are not a substitute for the normal appellate review process, nor may they be used to obtain reversal of a decision or a new trial.

An order dismissing the complaint is entered simultaneously herewith.

/s/ Carl E. Stewart

Carl E. Stewart

Chief Judge

April 1, 2016

MAY 17 2016

FIFTH CIRCUIT  
LYLE W. CAYCE, CLERK

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-16-90062 through 05-16-90065  
Petition for Review by [REDACTED]  
of the Final Order Filed April 14, 2016  
Dismissing Judicial Misconduct Complaint Against

[REDACTED]  
Under the Judicial Improvements Act of 2002.

---

ORDER

An Appellate Review Panel of the Judicial Council for the Fifth Circuit has reviewed the above-captioned petition for review, and all the members of the Panel have voted to affirm the order of Chief Judge Stewart, filed April 14, 2016, dismissing the Complaint of [REDACTED], against [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] under the Judicial Improvements Act of 2002.

The Order is therefore

**AFFIRMED.**

May 12, 2016  
Date



Priscilla R. Owen  
United States Circuit Judge  
For the Judicial Council of the Fifth Circuit