UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA ORLANDO DIVISION

LAWRENCE W. KONIECZKO and LAURIE F. KONIECZKO,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No: 6:23-cv-2109-CEM-EJK

ORANGE COUNTY, FL, DOE FIREMAN #1, DOE FIREMAN #2, **DOE FIRE MARSHAL, DOE 911 OPERATOR, DOE DEPUTY #1, DOE DEPUTY #2, DOE DEPUTY #3, DOE PARAMEDIC, ROBERT** LEBLANC, DOE BAILIFF, PATRICIA O'DEA, DOE FBI **AGENT-EMPLOYEE, 5 DCA** JUDGES, F. RAND WALLIS, JAY COHEN, JAMES EDWARDS, **KERRY EVANDER, JOHN** HARRIS, BRIAN LAMBERT, **RICHARD ORFINGER, WENDY** BERGER, PALMER, TORPY, DANIEL IRICK, PAUL BYRON, **CHARLES HUDNALL, DOE DIRECTOR**, and **KENNETH** NICHOLSON,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiffs Lawrence W. Konieczko and Laurie F. Konieczko have filed a motion seeking my disqualification pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 455 ("Motion"). (Doc. 15.) The Motion states that I have "bias in favor of an adverse party" and incorporates their arguments made in their Objection (Doc. 16) to my November 2, 2023, Order

denying their Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. 13). In their Objection (Doc. 16), Plaintiffs take issue with the timing and substance of the Order, but the Supreme Court has made clear:

[J]udicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion. . . . In and of themselves (*i.e.*, apart from surrounding comments or accompanying opinion), they cannot possibly show reliance upon an extrajudicial source; and can only in the rarest circumstances evidence the degree of favoritism or antagonism required . . . when no extrajudicial source is involved. Almost invariably, they are proper grounds for appeal, not for recusal."

Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) (internal citation omitted).

Plaintiffs may appeal the Order if they are dissatisfied with it, but it does not

form the basis for recusal. Since there was no other ascertainable reason presented for

recusal, the Motion is **DENIED**.

DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on November 16, 2023.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE