

(ORDER LIST 24 U.S.)

SATURDAY, JULY 19TH, 2025

JUDICIAL COMPLAINT

20-01 IN RE: LOGANKODIE21

The Court hereby censures the Honorable Kamaric Kodie for his conduct while presiding over SentinelStocks v. National Security Council that violated Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Code of Conduct. Furthermore, Judge Kodie is hereby suspended from presiding over any civil or criminal matters until such time as he successfully completes a written examination, to be prepared and administered by the Chief Judge of the District Court, assessing knowledge of pre-trial procedure, contempt authority, and basic courtroom management. Upon certification of successful completion by the Chief Judge, Judge Kodie's full judicial duties may be reinstated.

Opinion of the Court

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 20-02

IN RE: LOGANKODIE21

ON JUDICIAL COMPLAINT

[July 19, 2025]

CHIEF JUSTICE STONE delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case arises from a complaint of judicial misconduct filed against the Honorable Kamaric Kodie (LoganKodie21)¹, a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The complaint, brought forward by then-Acting Attorney General MarshalOperations, alleges that Judge Kodie engaged in conduct violative of multiple canons of the Judicial Code of Conduct during the course of presiding over *SentinelStocks v. National Security Council*, No. CV-053025-61, prior to his recusal from the case.

We are asked to consider whether Judge Kodie’s conduct violated the Code of Conduct for the United States Judges, and if so, what remedy—if any—is warranted. We find that the Judge’s actions did violate Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, and we issue a formal censure and suspension of duties accordingly.

I

In the matter of *In Re: Complaint Against DarkAngelB01*, 1 U.S. ___, No. 01-04 (2021), this Court unanimously held that it possessed the constitutional and inherent authority to discipline federal judges where no other adequate mechanism remains available, and where the conduct at issue implicates the integrity of the federal judiciary. As we stated in that case, the judiciary must ensure its internal standards are enforced to preserve public confidence. When conduct arises that calls a judge’s impartiality or competence into question, this Court may act in its disciplinary capacity to protect the structure of

¹ PDF Judicial Complaint In Re MarshalOperations v. Logankodi...

constitutional adjudication and the legitimacy of the judicial role when no other alternative exists.

While it is true that federal law imposes the power of hearing judicial complaints on the Court of Appeals, see 28 U.S. Code Chp. 16, no such court is used or present in our judiciary. Nor does any alternative statutory mechanism presently exist. As the Court previously recognized, “It can be reasonably assumed that the ultimate appellate authority therefore rests with the United States Supreme Court”, and that any powers conferred upon the Court of Appeals by law should reasonably be assumed to be held by this Court as the only body of appeal within our judiciary. This Court also has a history of handling judicial complaints when there is no other court to address them, and in the absence of a statutory remedy. See *In Re: MarshallOperations*, 13 U.S. ___, No. 13-01 (2024) and *In Re: Kingletttt*, 14 U.S. ___, No. 14-06 (2024).

Nonetheless, we urge Congress to develop a suitable statutory remedy to fill this gap in jurisdiction and power that otherwise must be assumed to be held by a court different from that designated by law.

II

On June 24th, 2025, Judge Kodie was assigned to preside over the case in *SentinelStocks*. According to the transcript of the proceedings² Judge Kodie signed civil summons to various individuals involved in the case, which promptly had to be nulled once the Judge became aware that summons had to be signed by the Clerk, rather than the Judge. Summons were issued and relevant parties were added to the case ticket on June 26th, 2025, and Acting Attorney General MarshalOperations was given 72 hours to respond on behalf of the United States, and MarshalOperations was

²<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1dchwLfSrK2cPegAVauoQj6W29e2MIVCp/view?usp=sharing> In order to view, please download and then open in your browser.

reminded at the 14th hour, the 39th hour. After roughly 50 hours since the initial notice, this Court loses all ability to comprehend the logic behind the next steps Judge Kodie undertook in presiding over the case.

Despite the 72 hour window for response provided by the Judicial Fairness Act, Pub. L. 22-162, having not yet elapsed, Judge Kodie seemingly suggested that MarshalOperations had failed to respond and was unable to meet the deadline. In a statement that completely perplexes this Court, Judge Kodie states “You have not yet sent your opening statement therefore I am going to see it as waived.” and furthermore threatens holding MarshalOperations in contempt of court if he fails to meet a deadline once again.

It is entirely possible that the Judge intended to refer to MarshalOperation’s initial response to the lawsuit, as ordinary pre-trial proceedings had not yet been completed, including periods for discovery, pre-trial motions, or other ordinary pre-trial proceedings. However, this assumption is immediately defeated by the fact that Judge Kodie made no attempt to clear any confusion, correct himself, and even doubled down on this blatant mistake. Once MarshalOperations stated that he waived his opening statement, which perplexes this Court on its own, Judge Kodie pinged the plaintiff and stated “Your turn”, referring to him to start his opening statement. The plaintiff immediately attempted to correct the Judge on his error, and Judge Kodie once again stated “The plaintiff may proceed with their opening statement” and then once again threatened MarshalOperations with contempt for posting a laughing gif. It appears that instead of completing ordinary pre-trial procedure, Judge Kodie moved to arguments as though the matter were at trial—without any of the procedural steps that precede it.

Furthermore, at 9:16 PM on June 30th, 2025, Judge Kodie threatened to hold various parties in *civil* contempt rather than criminal contempt for engaging in potential violations of decorum after days of irregular argumentation, confusion, and disruptions.

It is frankly difficult to determine the intentions behind Judge Kodie’s actions during these proceedings, or if he was

aware of the steps to be taken in any trial brought before his Court, and the confusion that this Court currently has appears to have been shared by all parties involved during proceedings.

III

A

Canon 1 of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges provides that judges should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary, further stating that “[a] judge should maintain and enforce high standards of conduct and should personally observe those standards, so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.”

A federal case does not commence with opening statements. It commences with the filing of a complaint under Rule 3 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, followed by service of process under Rule 4, responsive pleadings under Rule 12, and, where necessary, preliminary motions, and general case management. As this Court held in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009), the complaint must have “sufficient factual matter” to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face” before a court may proceed to evaluate the merits. In *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), we reaffirmed that a complaint must give fair notice of the claim and grounds upon which it rests.

Only after the pre-trial procedures have been completed may a court turn to the merits of the case. These procedural stages are not optional, unlike what Judge Kodie seemingly thought; they are the framework through which due process is guaranteed to all parties in a trial. As the Court observed in *Link v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962), judicial discretion must be exercised within the framework of the rules, and not in defiance of them.

Even assuming the complaint was facially sufficient, the absence of any mechanism to handle pre-trial motions, discovery, or other matters left the parties exposed to judicial action without meaningful opportunity to be heard. *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), requires courts to

consider the risk of erroneous deprivation through the procedures used. Here, the Court used none. That failure created not merely risk—but certainty—of procedural deprivation.

None of those foundational stages occurred here. Judge Kodie effectively dispensed with the basic architecture of civil litigation. The decision to proceed directly to opening statements transformed the judicial function into something wholly unrecognizable under our system of adjudication.

Federal civil procedure exists not for convenience, but to vindicate constitutional guarantees of fairness, notice, and structure. The orderly course of justice is not a matter of preference, it's a matter of law. “[T]he judge is not a mere moderator, but is the governor of the trial for the purpose of assuring its proper conduct and of determining questions of law.” *Quercia v. United States*, 289 U.S. 466, 289 U.S. 469 (1933). To disregard these steps is not merely inefficient, it is lawless. Judge Kodie treated the pre-trial framework as an inconvenience rather than the constitutional process it is, which amounts to procedural abdication.

Even if we were to assume that Judge Kodie merely misstated his intended course of action, and possessed familiarity with proper procedure—as he did serve as a Magistrate Judge for over six months prior to being confirmed by the Senate as a District Court Judge, where he handled pre-trial procedure in a multitude of cases—he made no effort to correct his errors or clear the confusion in the case’s proceedings, and instead doubled down and threatened various kinds of contempt to various parties involved.

In this case, it is clear that Judge Kodie’s actions gravely violated the integrity of the judiciary.

B

Canon 2 of the Code of Conduct instructs that judges must avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities. This includes a mandate for judges to respect and comply with the law at all times. This obligation extends not only to actual literal bias or misconduct, such as perhaps that which we have already outlined, but to conduct that, in the eyes of a reasonable observer, may undermine

Opinion of the Court

public confidence in the judge's integrity, neutrality, or fairness.

A proceeding that lacks order, clarity, or equal treatment risks far more than inefficiency—it risks the appearance that the outcome is arbitrary or preordained. Throughout presiding over the case, Judge Kodie issued coercive threats primarily against Acting Attorney General MarshalOperations, while establishing arbitrary deadlines and enforcing arbitrary rules of decorum that seemingly favored one party over the other. The result was not just perceived unfairness, as well as the blatant negligence of the law as this Court has already outlined, but the unmistakable appearance that the Court had ceased to function as a neutral adjudicator.

At no point did the Court address the plaintiff's own interruptions or acknowledge the confusion it had created regarding procedural posture. Instead, it escalated the situation by warning a single defendant — MarshalOperations — that failure to provide his “opening statement” would lead to criminal contempt, despite the absence of any formal briefing order, scheduling order, or procedural instruction, as this Court has already outlined. Judge Kodie made no attempt at any time to explain his rationale for threatening to hold MarshalOperations in contempt, except for one occasion where he posted a gif during proceedings.

When judicial actions appear to favor one party over another without a transparent, rule-based rationale Canon 2 is implicated. There was no rhyme, reason, or rationale provided, only that Judge Kodie would later hold a contempt hearing to determine whether or not to hold MarshalOperations in contempt at a date set out over a week in advance. Even when the Attorney General petitioned to ask why, Judge Kodie made no effort to provide rationale for threatening MarshalOperations with contempt.

Regardless of Judge Kodie's intent, the failure to maintain evenhanded decorum and the issuance of coercive threats against a party already operating under procedural

confusion created a public-facing appearance of impropriety. Justice must be administered not only with fairness, but with visible neutrality. That standard was not met here, and it is clear that Canon 2 of the Code of Conduct was violated in his uneven appearance of the enforcement of unexplained standards of decorum.

C

Canon 3 of the Code of Conduct requires that a judge “Should Perform the Duties of the Office Fairly, Impartially and Diligently.” Subsection (A)(3) further states that a judge “should be patient, dignified, respectful, and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity.” Subsection (A)(5) additionally states that “[a] judge should dispose promptly of the business of the court.” These duties are not aspirational—they are essential to the orderly and just functioning of any courtroom, and the fair deliverance of justice.

Judge Kodie’s conduct throughout presiding over *SentinelStocks v. National Security Council* failed to reflect these standards. His behavior and demeanor were frankly erratic and confusing, and his management of the courtroom was inconsistent. The judge made no attempt to enforce consistent rules of decorum or correct obvious procedural confusion. When challenged or questioned, he did not clarify the record or defuse tension; he escalated it.

This Court has long emphasized the importance of judicial temperament and balance in adversarial settings. For example, in *Offutt v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11 (1954), we reversed a contempt conviction where the judge has become “personally embroiled” in the conflict and had thereby compromised his objectivity. As Justice Frankfurter wrote in that case, “Justice must satisfy the appearance of justice.” *Id.* at 14.

A judge’s role in a case is not merely to issue order or assert authority, especially in our judiciary—it is to conduct proceedings with evenhanded restraint, ensuring all parties are heard in an atmosphere of fairness and mutual respect, and to adjudicate the facts of the case. Here, Judge Kodie vacillated between ignoring procedural structure and

wielding contempt threats as a substitute for control, which in itself is complete disorder.

Even when a party's behavior is disruptive or frustrating, it is the judge's duty to respond within the boundaries of professionalism and law. A courtroom is not governed by spontaneity or indignation. In *Snyder v. United States*, 472 U.S. 634, 645 (1985), the Court reaffirmed that the judiciary's power to discipline or control proceedings must be exercised in a manner consistent with fundamental fairness.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that Judge Kodie scheduled a hearing for a number of issues, including the threats of contempt against MarshalOperations, for over a week out in advance. It is unequivocally a judge's duty to dispose of the business of the court in a timely manner. None of the matters before the judge at the time constituted a matter which required extensive deliberation, but could instead be decided upon with relative speed. While courts retain discretion over scheduling, that discretion must be exercised with awareness of the practical consequences and with sensitivity to the burdens placed on litigants—particularly when those litigants face potential sanctions.

Judge Kodie's failure to maintain procedural discipline, control interruptions, and treat all parties with courtesy constitutes a clear violation of Canon 3. A judge who lacks the patience or restraint to manage a case with dignity undermines not only the litigants' confidence, but the integrity of the judiciary as a whole. That failure, standing alone, would warrant censure. In the context of the broader breakdown evident in this proceeding, it confirms the necessity of formal disciplinary action.

IV

In this case, the conduct at issue reflects a sustained failure to uphold the standards of the judicial office. Judge Kodie's disregard for procedural structure, inconsistent courtroom management, and disproportionate treatment of the parties constituted violations of Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. These are

absolutely not technical lapses, but demonstrate a complete negligence or lack of awareness of basic judicial proceedings.

The record demonstrates that Judge Kodie presided over the case without adherence to even the most basic elements of pre-trial litigation. He threatened contempt based on unwritten and untold expectations, and delayed resolution of consequential matters involving potential sanctions. Each of these failures, missteps, and mishaps would be concerning in isolation, but taken together, they amount to a breakdown in judicial role and temperament.

We recognize that Judge Kodie previously served as a Magistrate Judge for the District Court for the District of Columbia for approximately six months. We also recognize that he has held a Supreme Court Bar since January of 2024, for nearly a year and seven months, placing him as a long-time and distinguished member of our legal community. That context adds to the confusion that this Court has over his conduct, because it removes any logical explanation for these errors, lapses in judgement, and misconduct.

While this was his first major case since confirmation as a District Judge, he handled numerous cases during their pre-trial proceedings during his prior tenure as a Magistrate Judge. Regardless of the context of whether or not this was his first case on his own, it does not excuse the misconduct, but it may help inform the appropriate remedy. There is no indication at this time of persistent bad faith or an inherently corrupt motive. Nevertheless, the seriousness of the violations demands a formal and public response.

Accordingly, a public censure is necessary, and this Court hereby censures the Honorable Kamaric Kodie for his conduct while presiding over *SentinelStocks v. National Security Council* that violated Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Code of Conduct. Furthermore, Judge Kodie is hereby suspended from presiding over any civil or criminal matters until such time as he successfully completes a written examination, to be prepared and administered by the Chief Judge of the District Court, assessing knowledge of pre-trial procedure, contempt authority, and basic courtroom management. Upon certification of successful completion by the Chief Judge, Judge Kodie's full judicial duties may be reinstated.