

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KHOR CHIN LIM,

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

12-cv-552-bbc

SCOTT WALKER, JOHN J. McALARY,
DIANE F. BOSSE, BRYAN R. WILLIAMS,
ROBES S. McMILLEN, E. LEO MILONAS,
MICHAEL COLODNER, STAPLES, INC.,
RON SARGANT, CITY OF MILPITAS,
JOSE ESTEVES, MARK GRIFFITHS, DREW WINTERS,
BOARD OF REGENTS OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM,
GOH CHOK TONG, QUEST DIAGNOSTICS, INC.,
KENNETH W. FREEMAN, SURYA MOHAPATRA,
MARK KHOO, FRANK VAN ORDEN,
MITT ROMNEY, ED GALLARDO, LAURIE SMITH,
SARAH HOLIDAY, M. MILLER,
BAYMONT INNS AND SUITES, BARBARA B. CRABB,
FRANK EASTERBROOK, WILLIAM BAUER,
ANN WILLIAMS, J.B. VAN HOLLEN,
RONALD HACKER, AMIRE SAM DIBAEI,
YOK LAW, LLOYD SMITH LLC,
MATTHEW PALMER, LLOYD SMITH,
JOSE S. ESTEVES, JOHN REID, CHARLES N. CLEVERT and
DOES 1 through 18, inclusive,

Defendants.

On August 10, 2012, I dismissed the complaint filed by plaintiff Khor Chin Lim as frivolous and malicious because the allegations repeated those that have been dismissed previously by me and by other courts. Plaintiff has now filed more than one motion to recuse me and reassign this case to another district judge. Noting that he has added me to

the list of defendants in this case, plaintiff alleges that “there exists a conflict of interest” that requires my disqualification. As grounds for recusal, plaintiff points to my dismissal of his previous case, Khor Chin Lim v. Scott Walker, 12-cv-492-bbc (W.D. Wis. July 25, 2012), as evidence of partiality.

First, plaintiff does not support his recusal motion with evidence that a conflict exists. Even assuming that his allegations are true, the facts asserted do not demonstrate an actual conflict of interest.

Second, and more important, I addressed the fact that plaintiff named me as a defendant in the dismissal order and concluded that recusal was not warranted under the circumstances. As I explained in the dismissal order, judicial rulings alone do not form a sufficient basis for recusal. Litekey v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994). Other than pointing to the adverse judicial ruling in his previous case, plaintiff does not allege any facts that would cause a reasonable person to believe that I harbor personal bias or prejudice toward plaintiff. Accordingly, his recusal motions will be denied.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff Khor Chin Lim’s motion to reassign, dkt. #5, motion to recuse, dkt. # 7, and his second motion to recuse, dkt. # 12, are DENIED.

Entered this 21st day of August, 2012.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge