

# **Complaint and Request for Investigation of Judicial Conduct – Judge Mindy S. Glazer**

**To the Florida Judicial Qualifications  
Commission,  
Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial  
Circuit,  
and Other Appropriate Oversight  
Authorities:**

**I am writing as a concerned citizen to lodge a formal complaint and request investigation into the judicial conduct of County Court Judge Mindy S. Glazer of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in Miami-Dade County, Florida, arising out of proceedings involving Florida International University student Gabriela Saldana. This case has drawn significant public attention because it involves a student's WhatsApp message**

– described by the student as a joke – which has nevertheless been treated as the basis for serious criminal charges and detention.

According to widely circulated news reports and recordings, during bond proceedings Judge Glazer addressed Ms. Saldana’s WhatsApp message about “dropping bombs” on a college campus and stated in substance that while the student may consider it a joke, “to an objective person, it’s not a joke, and it would be enough for probable cause.” This comment has been extensively quoted in press and social media coverage and has become a focal point for public concern about how Florida courts are treating student speech, political commentary, and hyperbolic digital messages.

**My concern is not that the court should ignore public safety, but that Judge Glazer's public characterization of this private, context-specific message appears to cross the line from careful, neutral judicial analysis into a broad, categorical public statement that may be inconsistent with the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct and with basic constitutional principles governing "true threats" and protected expression. When a judge publicly declares that a plainly context-bound joke among students can, standing alone, be "enough for probable cause," it risks sending a dangerous signal that impulsive or hyperbolic online speech by young people will be treated as criminal by default, rather than scrutinized for intent, capability, and actual threat.**

**From the standpoint of an informed member of the public, several aspects of Judge Glazer's handling of this matter and her public remarks raise serious concerns under the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct:**

**Canon 1 and Canon 2A require judges to uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary, to respect and comply with the law, and to act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the judiciary's integrity and impartiality, while avoiding both impropriety and the appearance of impropriety. The commentary to Canon 2A recognizes that irresponsible or improper judicial conduct erodes public confidence and that judges must accept meaningful restrictions on their speech and conduct in order to maintain the appearance of fairness and neutrality. Judge Glazer's widely**

publicized comment, in the context of a highly charged case involving student speech and campus safety, creates the appearance that she is prejudging legal issues about what qualifies as a threat and what constitutes probable cause, instead of carefully limiting her remarks to the facts and law actually before her.

Canon 3, including Canon 3B(5), requires a judge to perform judicial duties impartially and fairly and prohibits a judge, in the performance of judicial duties, from manifesting bias or prejudice by words or conduct. Publicly framing a student's private digital joke as sufficient for probable cause, without careful explanation of context, intent, and legal standards, risks conveying a bias toward criminalizing student speech and social-media-style expression, especially when the speech relates to controversial

political themes. Even if that was not Judge Glazer's intent, the reasonable public perception is that she is inclined to interpret youthful online comments in the harshest possible light, which undermines confidence in her impartiality when presiding over cases involving students, protest, or political or campus-related speech.

Canon 3B(9) restricts judges from making public comments about pending or impending matters that might reasonably be expected to affect the outcome or impair the fairness of the proceeding. Although the comment at issue was made in court, it has been widely disseminated in the media and is now understood by the public as Judge Glazer's definitive characterization of Ms. Saldana's conduct and the legal

sufficiency of the evidence. In effect, her statement functions as a public pronouncement that this kind of student speech meets the threshold for probable cause, even as the case remains pending and subject to motion practice, plea negotiations, or trial. This kind of publicly amplified comment can reasonably be expected to influence public opinion, prosecutorial posture, and the perceived fairness of the proceeding, which is precisely what Canon 3B(9) is intended to prevent.

Beyond these specific canons, Florida's judicial discipline framework and the Judicial Qualifications Commission's constitutional mandate reflect a core principle: judges must not only avoid actual bias or misconduct, but must also avoid conduct that creates a reasonable

appearance of bias, prejudice, or disregard for constitutional protections. The JQC is expressly charged, under Article V, Section 12 of the Florida Constitution and its own rules, with investigating allegations of misconduct by state judges and recommending appropriate discipline to the Florida Supreme Court when warranted.

In this case, Judge Glazer's words and the manner in which they have been publicized raise legitimate questions about whether she has:

- Maintained the appearance of impartiality and open-mindedness required when evaluating alleged threats and probable cause in sensitive, politically charged cases.
- Avoided comments that can reasonably be perceived as prejudging the legality of

**student speech and private digital communications before those issues are fully litigated.**

**– Fully honored the heightened responsibilities and constraints on judicial speech recognized in Canon 2A and the commentary to Canon 3B(9), particularly in an era when courtroom remarks are instantly broadcast and debated online.**

**I respectfully urge the Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission to open a formal investigation into whether Judge Glazer's conduct in this matter, including her public remarks about Ms. Saldana's WhatsApp message, violates one or more provisions of the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct and whether discipline, corrective action, or other remedial measures are warranted. I further request that the Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit**

**review this incident, evaluate whether it has impaired public confidence in the court's neutrality toward students and campus-related speech, and consider any additional administrative or educational steps needed to ensure that judges in the circuit handle digital speech and "joke" cases in a manner consistent with constitutional protections and Florida's judicial ethics requirements.**

**At a minimum, I ask that the appropriate authorities:**

- Determine whether Judge Glazer's comments and decision-making in this case were consistent with Canons 1, 2A, and 3 of the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct.**
- Consider whether a public admonishment, written guidance, or other disciplinary or corrective action is**

necessary to reaffirm the judiciary's commitment to impartial, context-sensitive treatment of student speech and digital communication.

– Clarify, through guidance or training, the expectations for Florida judges when addressing alleged threats, online speech, and politically charged “jokes,” so that future cases do not repeat or amplify the same concerns.

I do not claim specialized legal expertise, and I recognize that judges must make difficult decisions under pressure. However, from the perspective of an informed citizen observing this case, Judge Glazer's remarks and the manner in which they have been amplified in the media appear to undermine public confidence in the judiciary's impartiality and in its understanding of students'

rights and digital communication. That is precisely the kind of appearance that the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct, and the oversight authority of the Judicial Qualifications Commission, are designed to address.

Thank you for your attention to this complaint and for your service in protecting the integrity of Florida's judiciary. I respectfully request written confirmation that this complaint has been received and an indication whether it will be opened for investigation.

Sincerely,  
Concerned Citizen  
[City, State]  
[Date]