

(ORDER LIST 31 U.S.)

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10TH, 2025

**CERTIORARI GRANTED**

21-05            SAD66567 v. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted.

The case is limited to the following question:

1. Whether the absence of counsel at critical stages of a criminal prosecution constitutes structural error with prejudice presumed, or whether *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984) requires an additional showing that the absence affected the outcome.

**JUDICIAL COMPLAINT**

21-06            IN RE: 139145ALAN

The complaint is dismissed.

Per Curiam

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

---

No. 21-06

---

**IN RE: 139145ALAN****ON JUDICIAL COMPLAINT**

[September 10, 2025]

PER CURIAM.

This matter comes before the Court under the Judicial Integrity and Accountability Act of 2025, which amends Chapter 16 of the U.S. Code to vest in this Court the responsibility to review complaints of judicial misconduct. Complainant alleges that in the criminal case *United States v. Sad66567*, CR-072125-22 (D.D.C.), the defendant's appointed defense counsel failed to meet basic obligations, and that the district judges — including the respondent, Chief Judge 139145Alan — permitted the trial and sentencing to proceed despite those failures. The complaint argues that his conduct violated the Canons of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges and deprived the complainant of their constitutional rights. The threshold question that this Court is permitted to review is whether the allegations, if true, amount to conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts on behalf of the judge, and, whether or not the judge's decision to allow trial to proceed in the given circumstances constitutes judicial misconduct.

The line between reversible error and sanctionable misconduct in this case is critical. The latter requires behavior that reflects impropriety, bias, or abandonment of judicial duty. The former concerns mistakes in applying law or managing proceedings, which are corrected by appeal. Here, the allegations — though they may be serious — fall squarely in the realm of appellate review. They raise potential Sixth Amendment claims and issues suitable for appeal, such as perhaps in the complainant's pending appeal, see *Sad66567 v. United States*, No. 21-05 (U.S. filed

Sep. 8, 2025) (pending), but they do not establish misconduct by Judge Alan Jones.

Accordingly, the complaint must be dismissed. This Court does not minimize the importance of safeguarding effective assistance of counsel, nor does it seek to condone judicial inattention to attorney default. However, discipline in this case is not the appropriate vehicle, and the complainant retains the full benefit of appellate review — the ordinary channel for resolving such claims.

The complaint is therefore dismissed.