

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6216

(202) 225-6906
judiciary.house.gov

August 26, 2026

The Honorable Daniel N. Rosen
U.S. Attorney for the District of Minnesota
300 S 4th Street, Suite 600
Minneapolis, MN 55415

Dear U.S. Attorney Rosen:

Please find enclosed the letter we sent to Attorney General Todd Blanche about the shocking pattern of Department of Justice (DOJ) attorneys lying to federal courts, misrepresenting facts, withholding material information from federal judges, and evading or defying lawful court orders. This trend has been observed and denounced by judges in hundreds of federal court cases, leading to removal of the traditional “presumption of regularity” accorded to the representations and filings of DOJ lawyers. The reputation of the Trump DOJ has flown off a cliff.

The Attorney General has failed to respond to this letter by the requested deadline. We certainly hope you will be more forthcoming with Congress about the appalling breakdown of prosecutorial standards and ethics taking place in your jurisdiction.

Both the House Committee on the Judiciary and independent observers have identified your office as one of the most significant and routine violators of basic legal and ethical standards, like the duty of showing candor to the court and the obligation to comply with judicial orders. Multiple federal judges in your district have questioned the candor and honesty of your attorneys and your voluntary compliance with binding court orders.¹

As you are aware, every attorney in your office owes a duty of candor to the courts before which he or she appears. Federal prosecutors are officers of the court, pledged to prioritize the interest of justice above all other considerations.² Under 28 U.S.C. § 530B, attorneys for the government are bound by the ethics rules of the states in which they practice, including prohibitions on knowingly making a false statement of fact or law to a court and failing to

¹ Ryan Goodman, et al., *The “Presumption of Regularity” in Trump Administration Litigation (4th Edition)*, JUST SECURITY (last updated June 22, 2026), <https://www.justsecurity.org/120547/presumption-regularity-trump-administration-litigation/>; J. David McSwane, Pratheek Rebala & Carla Astudillo, *Federal Judges Chastise Trump’s Justice Department for “Unlawful,” “Unethical” and “Unseemly” Conduct*, PROPUBLICA (July 28, 2026), www.propublica.org/article/justice-department-presumption-of-regularity.

² Justice Manual § 9-27.000, *Principles of Federal Prosecution*, U.S. DEP’T OF JUST., <https://www.justice.gov/jm/jm-9-27000-principles-federal-prosecution> (last visited Aug. 12, 2026).

correct a material misstatement. The Justice Manual similarly obligates Department attorneys to adhere to these professional responsibility standards and requires that alleged attorney misconduct be reported to the Office of Professional Responsibility.³ Finally, any misrepresentation to the court, if made knowingly or at the direction of your office, could be the subject of criminal prosecution and penalties for false statements or perjury under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 and 18 U.S.C. § 1621.


The Committee is investigating DOJ's—and specifically your office's—pattern of misleading the judicial branch, and by extension, the American people. We further seek to understand whether the pattern of misrepresentations and noncompliance identified by federal judges in your district reflects decisions made within your office, direction from Main Justice, or both. We also seek information as to whether attorneys in your office who questioned or rejected illegal orders have been disciplined or otherwise retaliated against by DOJ or the Trump Administration. Accordingly, we request you provide the following records no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 9, 2026:

1. An accounting of every instance in which a judge has found a government attorney in your office has lied, misled, or lacked sufficient candor before the court or failed to comply or ensure compliance with a court order, including instances where these concerns were conveyed privately to you or your staff;
2. For each matter identified under Request #1, all internal communications expressing concern, hesitation, or disapproval of any such filing or oral submission to the court, including but not limited to resignation letters, meeting notes, emails, memos, or comments in draft documents;
3. All communications from January 20, 2025, between your office and the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, or any supervisory DOJ attorney in Washington, DC, concerning matters in which attorneys in your office have been accused of misrepresenting their case or evading lawful court orders;
4. All communications from January 20, 2025, in which officials in the Office of the Attorney General, Office of the Deputy Attorney General, or any supervisory DOJ attorney in Washington, DC, directed, edited, or approved factual representations, declarations, or certifications made to a federal court by attorneys in your office; and,
5. All records from January 20, 2025, related to disciplinary or other personnel matters involving lack of candor, non-compliance with court orders, or other attorney professional responsibility matters in your office, including but not limited to investigations conducted by the courts and state bars.

³ Justice Manual § 1-4.000, *Standards of Conduct*, U.S. DEP'T OF JUST., <https://www.justice.gov/jm/jm-1-4000-standards-conduct> (last visited Aug. 12, 2026).

The Committee expects your office to preserve all documents and communications relating to the matters described in this letter. This preservation obligation includes but is not limited to: emails; text messages; messages sent via applications such as Signal, WhatsApp, or other encrypted platforms; handwritten notes; draft documents; calendar entries; and call logs. This obligation applies to communications on both official and personal devices and accounts, and to all current and former DOJ personnel and contractors. Please confirm in writing by September 9, 2026, that you and DOJ have taken all necessary steps to comply with this preservation requirement.

Very truly yours,



Jamie Raskin
Ranking Member

Encl.

cc: The Honorable Jim Jordan, Chairman

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6216

(202) 225-6906
judiciary.house.gov

July 14, 2026

The Honorable Todd W. Blanche
Acting Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Acting Attorney General Blanche:

Under your leadership, the Department of Justice (DOJ) has made a habit of violating its obligation to tell the truth. In case after case, federal judges have found that DOJ lawyers have lied in court and that the Trump Administration has defied court orders. I write to ask you to explain this grave violation of the fundamental duties of federal prosecutors charged with representing the interests of justice.

In hundreds of cases over the past 18 months, federal judges have called into question the truthfulness of DOJ's statements to the court and the Department's good faith compliance with court orders.¹ These judges have been appointed by every president from Ronald Reagan to Donald Trump himself.

- A federal judge in Rhode Island wrote that **"DOJ has proven unworthy of this trust at every point in this case."**²
- A federal judge in California wrote last year that **"[t]he 'administrative record' submitted by the government is a sham."**³

¹ Ryan Goodman, et al., *The "Presumption of Regularity" in Trump Administration Litigation (4th Edition)*, JUST SECURITY (last updated June 22, 2026), <https://www.justsecurity.org/120547/presumption-regularity-trump-administration-litigation/>.

² Mem. & Order at 1, *In re: Administrative Subpoena to Rhode Island Hospital*, 1:26-mc-00007 (D.R.I. May 13, 2026), ECF No. 38, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ri.62049/gov.uscourts.ri.62049.38.0.pdf>.

³ Order on Cross-Mots. for Summ. J. at 12, *Am. Fed'n of Gov't Emps., AFL-CIO v. U.S. Off. of Pers. Mgmt.*, 3:25-cv-01780 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2025), ECF No. 261, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.444883/gov.uscourts.cand.444883.261.0.pdf>.

- A federal judge in Illinois found that DOJ’s **“widespread misrepresentations call into question everything that Defendants say they are doing.”**⁴
- A federal judge wrote in the wake of the violent Minnesota immigration enforcement operation, **“There has been an undeniable move by the Government in the past month to defy court orders or at least to stretch the legal process to the breaking point.”**⁵
- A Trump appointee in Rhode Island recently slammed the DOJ for **“subterfuge”** and making sworn declarations to multiple courts that were **“at best, deceptive, if not intentionally and knowingly false.”**⁶

The episodes of lying in court are now legion. The question is no longer *whether* DOJ lawyers are lying to the courts. The question is *to what extent* DOJ leadership and the White House have directly ordered these attorneys to violate their ethical and legal obligations, and whether there has been any discipline imposed on government attorneys and agents for violating the sacrosanct duty to tell the truth in court.

For years, the federal court system has depended on the “presumption of regularity.” This means a court will rely on the federal government to tell the truth and obey court orders. But courts across the land have noted that DOJ’s actions have ruined that presumption. At a hearing in the Kilmar Abrego Garcia case, Judge Paula Xinis of Maryland told government counsel, **“You have taken the presumption of regularity and you’ve destroyed it in my view.”**⁷ Judge Mustafa T. Kasubhai of Oregon stated: **“The presumption of regularity that has been previously extended to [the government] that it could be taken at its word—with little doubt about its intentions and stated purposes—no longer holds.”**⁸ In another case, Judge Christine P. O’Hearn of New Jersey stated: **“The presumption of regularity and integrity previously and routinely afforded to the Executive branch and the United States Attorney’s Office has been undeniably eroded in this jurisdiction and across the country.”**⁹

Last year, DOJ Acting Deputy Director for the Office of Immigration Litigation Erez Reuveni reported that he “became aware of the plans of DOJ leadership to resist court orders.” In a whistleblower complaint to Congress, Mr. Reuveni revealed that then-DOJ senior official Emil Bove, now a federal judge, told prosecutors in an internal DOJ meeting that the group may need

⁴ Op. and Order at 13, *Chicago Headline Club v. Noem*, 1:25-cv-12173 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 20, 2025), ECF No. 281, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.487571/gov.uscourts.ilnd.487571.281.0_3.pdf.

⁵ Order Adopting R. & R. at 3, *Duran v. Bondi*, 0:25-cv-04816 (D. Minn. Jan 25, 2026), ECF No. 11, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.229968/gov.uscourts.mnd.229968.11.0.pdf>.

⁶ Mattathias Schwartz, *Losing Trust in Justice Dept., Judges Call Out Its Lawyers’ Behavior*, N.Y. TIMES (June 1, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/06/01/us/justice-department-lawyers-judges-trump.html>.

⁷ Evidentiary Hr’g Tr. at 11:8-9, *Abrego Garcia v. Noem*, 8:25-cv-00951 (D. Md. July 14, 2025), ECF No. 235, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mdd.578815/gov.uscourts.mdd.578815.235.0.pdf>.

⁸ Op. & Order at 22, *United States v. Oregon*, 6:25-cv-01666 (D. Or. Feb. 5, 2026), ECF No. 73, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ord.188997/gov.uscourts.ord.188997.73.0_2.pdf.

⁹ Order at 2, *Singh v. Tsoukaris*, 1:26-cv-01531 (D.N.J. Feb. 20, 2026), ECF No. 10, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.njd.591878/gov.uscourts.njd.591878.10.0.pdf>.

to tell federal judges “**fuck you**” and ignore any court orders blocking the removal of detainees from the United States via federal aircraft, emphasizing that “the planes need to take off no matter what.”¹⁰ Just days after this incident, you and Mr. Bove advised then-Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Kristi Noem that she was legally permitted to order officials to transfer immigration detainees to El Salvador’s brutal CECOT prison, notwithstanding a clear court order directing her *not* to do so.¹¹ The illegality of this order was so obvious that, while you were advising then-Secretary Noem to violate the court order, DOJ line attorneys were doing their duty and separately advising DHS officials that such a transfer would be unlawful and might result in Administration officials being held in contempt of court.¹²

Mr. Reuveni, who revealed this conspiracy to violate court orders, was fired for telling a federal court the truth. When appearing before the District Court of Maryland, Mr. Reuveni candidly informed the court that the government had made an administrative mistake when it deported Mr. Abrego Garcia from the country, despite a valid court order expressly forbidding the government from removing him. Mr. Reuveni’s superiors ordered him to withdraw this accurate statement and replace it with a lie: that the deportation of Mr. Abrego Garcia was not in error.¹³ When Mr. Reuveni refused to do so, you terminated him for failure to “follow a directive from your superiors”—in other words, his refusal to follow an illegal order.¹⁴

These are not isolated incidents. Below are just 15 examples of judicial findings that DOJ misled the court or defied a lawful court order. The frequency of such conduct, in courts around the United States, strongly suggests that under your leadership, DOJ prosecutors are being ordered, or at the very least encouraged, to violate the law.

- *In re: Administrative Subpoena to Rhode Island Hospital, 1:26-mc-00007 (D.R.I)*—Judge Mary McElroy, a Trump appointee, found that the DOJ misrepresented and withheld information from two federal courts as part of an investigation into gender affirming care at a Rhode Island hospital. In her May 13, 2026, order quashing an administrative subpoena issued by the Department, she eviscerated the DOJ’s lack of candor: “The United States Department of Justice (‘DOJ’) possesses immense prosecutorial authority and discretion. As citizens, we trust that federal prosecutors, when wielding this awesome power against a state, a company, or certainly against vulnerable children, will play fair and be honest

¹⁰ Devlin Barrett, *Justice Dept. Leader Suggested Violating Court Orders, Whistle-Blower Says*, N.Y. TIMES (June 24, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/24/us/politics/justice-department-emil-bove-trump-deportations-reuveni.html>.

¹¹ Marty Lederman, *The Continuing Saga of Chief Judge Boasberg’s Contempt of Court Inquiry Involving Todd Blanche and Emil Bove*, JUST SECURITY (June 15, 2026), <https://www.justsecurity.org/142031/boasberg-contempt-blanche-bove/>.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ Glenn Thrush, *Justice Dept. Accuses Top Immigration Lawyer of Failing to Follow Orders*, N.Y. TIMES (Apr. 5, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/05/us/politics/justice-dept-immigration-lawyer-leave.html>.

with its counterparts and the judiciary. **DOJ has proven unworthy of this trust at every point in this case.**¹⁵

- *Iastrebov v. Warden, Baker County Detention Facility*, 2:26-cv-01697 (M.D. Fla.)—After the DOJ reversed its own position on whether a petitioner was entitled to an individualized bond hearing rather than mandatory detention, Judge Kyle Dudek of the Middle District of Florida described the DOJ’s flip-flopping in a June 11, 2026, order as a **“masterclass in litigation cynicism,”** highlighting that the Department **“has shown that it cannot follow this Court’s explicit directions.”**¹⁶
- *National Trust for Historic Preservation v. National Park Service*, 1:25-cv-04316 (D.D.C.)—When the DOJ attempted to circumvent a ruling enjoining the physical development of the President’s White House ballroom project, Judge Richard Leon issued a memorandum opinion on April 16, 2026, addressing the DOJ’s bad faith compliance with his initial injunction. Judge Leon said that the Department’s position was **“neither a reasonable nor a correct reading of my Order!”** and claimed that the government’s position was **“to say the least, incredible, if not disingenuous.”**¹⁷
- *In re: Kevin Bolan*, 1:26-ad-00003 (D.R.I.)—Judge Melissa DuBose referred Kevin Bolan, the head of the Civil Division for the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the District of Rhode Island, for disciplinary proceedings in May 2026, after Mr. Bolan acknowledged that the government failed to disclose critical factual information to Judge DuBose about a detained immigrant petitioning for release. In her referral, Judge DuBose said that the government’s **“lack of candor to this court,”** needed to be addressed and fully investigated.¹⁸ Ultimately, the Chief Judge for the District of Rhode Island wrote to Mr. Bolan noting that the government’s knowing omission of critical factual information enabled DHS to make false accusations against Judge DuBose that put her in personal danger, citing the government’s misrepresentations to the Court as a **“critical link in a sequence that led to a serious failure of justice.”**¹⁹

¹⁵ Mem. & Order at 1, *In re: Administrative Subpoena to Rhode Island Hospital*, 1:26-mc-00007 (D.R.I. May 13, 2026), ECF No. 38, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.rid.62049/gov.uscourts.rid.62049.38.0.pdf>.

¹⁶ Order at 2, *Iastrebov v. Warden, Baker Cnty. Det. Facility*, 2:26-cv-1697 (M.D. Fla. June 11, 2026), ECF No. 13, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.flmd.460010/gov.uscourts.flmd.460010.13.0.pdf>.

¹⁷ Mem. Op. at 3, *Nat’l Tr. for Historic Pres. in the U.S. v. Nat’l Park Serv.*, 1:25-cv-04316 (D.D.C. Apr. 16, 2026), ECF No. 72, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.dcd.287645/gov.uscourts.dcd.287645.72.0_4.pdf.

¹⁸ Mattathias Schwartz, *Judge Refers Justice Dept. Lawyer for Possible Discipline, Calling Out ‘Lack of Candor’*, N.Y. TIMES (May 5, 2026), <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/05/05/us/politics/rhode-island-judge-justice-department-immigrant.html>.

¹⁹ Letter from Chief Judge John J. McConnell, Jr. to Kevin Bolan at 2, *In re: Kevin Bolan*, 1:26-ad-00003 (D.R.I. June 16, 2026), ECF No. 7, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.rid.62085/gov.uscourts.rid.62085.7.0.pdf>.

- United States v. Rabbitt, 1:25-cr-00693 (N.D. Ill.)—During a closed-door hearing in May 2026 concerning the attempted prosecution of six individuals who protested Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) operations in Chicago, Judge April Perry slammed the DOJ lawyers for abusing the trust of the Court: “I do believe deeply in the presumption of regularity and that most government attorneys are doing the best they can to do the right thing. **That trust has been broken.**”²⁰ U.S. Attorney Andrew Boutros dismissed the case after it was revealed that prosecutors engaged in misconduct related to the grand jury proceedings.
- In re: Grand Jury Subpoenas, 0:26-mc-00043 (D. Minn.)—In June 2026, a federal judge upheld a challenge to grand jury subpoenas sought by the DOJ to Minnesota Governor Tim Walz and his allies, saying that the Department’s “**asserted investigatory purpose for the challenged subpoenas is risible,**” and noted “overwhelming” evidence showing that the subpoenas were not proper investigatory proceedings but instead constituted a “**blatantly unlawful and unethical use of the grand jury process**” meant to “**harass, coerce, and retaliate**” against Minnesota officials who defied the federal government’s efforts to “coerce” them into assisting with the Administration’s mass deportation agenda.²¹
- Floyd v. Department of Justice, 1:26-cv-01399 (E.D. Va.)—On June 24, 2026, Judge Leonie M. Brinkema wrote that the litigation challenging the so-called “Anti-Weaponization” slush fund would proceed to trial. While Judge Brinkema had provided the government with the opportunity to have the suit dismissed by certifying in writing that there would be no further action on the proposed fund, **the DOJ refused “to accord a genuine degree of trustworthiness to their representations.”** Despite DOJ’s public representations before Congress and two federal courts that plans for the fund would not move forward, Judge Brinkema emphasized that the government’s unwillingness to offer a signed declaration raised concerns about the veracity of their claims considering President Trump’s conflicting comments.²²
- Singh v. Tsoukaris, 1:26-cv-01531 (D.N.J.)—On February 20, 2026, in an order concerning the apparent transfer of a habeas petitioner from Delaney Hall to Metropolitan Detention Center Brooklyn in violation of the court’s no-transfer order, Judge O’Hearn stated that **the presumption of regularity and integrity afforded to the Executive branch and U.S. Attorney’s Office “has been undeniably eroded in this jurisdiction and across the country,”** and ordered that **the court would no longer accept factual representations from the**

²⁰ Tr. of Proceedings at 23, *United States v. Rabbitt*, 1:25-cr-00693 (N.D. Ill. May 21, 2026), ECF No. 185, <https://www.scribd.com/document/1042086656/USA-v-Rabbitt-et-al-Transcript>.

²¹ Order at 18–25, *In re: Grand Jury Subpoenas*, 0:26-mc-00043 (D. Minn. June 22, 2026), ECF No. 1, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.234490/gov.uscourts.mnd.234490.1.0.pdf>.

²² Order at 1–4, *Floyd v. Dep’t of Just.*, 1:26-cv-01399-LMB (E.D. Va. June 24, 2026), ECF No. 96, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.vaed.596617/gov.uscourts.vaed.596617.96.0.pdf>.

government unless made under oath by a declarant with personal knowledge.²³ Judge O’Hearn also wrote that **the Court had “good reason to suspect” that a declaration filed by the DOJ** identifying 56 instances in which lawful orders of judges in the District of New Jersey were violated **significantly underreported the actual number of offenses.**²⁴

- *Duran v. Bondi*, 0:25-cv-04816 (D. Minn.)—On January 25, 2026, in an order concerning the habeas petition and bond hearing request of an Ecuadorian national with no criminal history, Judge Michael J. Davis stated, **“There has been an undeniable move by the Government in the past month to defy court orders or at least to stretch the legal process to the breaking point in an attempt to deny noncitizens their due process rights.”**²⁵
- *Clarke v. Nassau County Correctional Center*, 2:25-cv-6773 (E.D.N.Y.)—On December 18, 2025, Judge Gary R. Brown ordered the Assistant U.S. Attorney for a district that held a Jamaican noncitizen detainee in conditions that were “substandard, abhorrent and likely unlawful”²⁶ to **“show cause why the Court should not consider entering an order of contempt or some other remedy in connection with ICE’s failures to follow its orders in this case.”**²⁷ As justification for his order, Judge Brown explained that the government had **“(1) filed sworn evidence from a supervisory officer containing rank hearsay and demonstrably false statements, (2) ignored at least three court directives and (3) blatantly refused to comply with a court order,”**²⁸ including by submitting a declaration stating that the detainee had been transferred between facilities separated by such distance that it was “objectively impossible that the transport was completed” by the purported time. Judge Brown noted, **“These misstatements of fact serve to undermine the information presented and the reliability of the records maintained by ICE.”**²⁹
- *United States v. Quintanilla-Chavez*, 5:25-cr-00388 (W.D. Tex.)—On December 8, 2025, Judge Xavier Rodriguez denied the government’s motion to reconsider the dismissal of an indictment. The court found that both **“The sworn affidavit in support of the criminal complaint was riddled with false statements,”** and **“The sworn testimony on this issue was blatantly false.”**³⁰ Judge Rodriguez

²³ Order at 2, *Singh v. Tsoukaris*, 1:26-cv-01531 (D.N.J. Feb. 20, 2026), ECF No. 10, <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.njd.591878/gov.uscourts.njd.591878.10.0.pdf>.

²⁴ *Id.* at 3.

²⁵ Order Adopting R. & R. at 3, *Duran v. Bondi*, 0:25-cv-04816 (D. Minn. Jan 25, 2026), <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.229968/gov.uscourts.mnd.229968.11.0.pdf>.

²⁶ Mem. & Order at 15, *Clarke v. Nassau Cnty. Corr. Ctr.*, 2:25-cv-6773 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 18, 2025), ECF No. 14, <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/72006132/14/clarke-v-nassau-county-correctional-center/>.

²⁷ *Id.* at 24.

²⁸ *Id.* at 3.

²⁹ *Id.* at 10.

³⁰ Order Den. Mot. for Recons. at 3, *United States v. Quintanilla-Chavez*, 5:25-cr-00388 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 8, 2025), ECF No. 67, <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/70693989/67/united-states-v-quintanilla-chavez/>.

continued, noting that an Assistant U.S. Attorney had conceded that an agent “**misrepresented what was going on**,”³¹ and stating in a footnote that the court “considered but declined personal sanctions against the federal officers in this case for their lack of candor, warning that it would not tolerate any further misrepresentations.”³²

- *Chicago Headline Club v. Noem*, 1:25-cv-12173 (N.D. Ill.)—On November 20, 2025, Judge Sara Lee Ellis issued a decision in a case brought by a group of news outlets, journalists, students, and other Chicago-area community members, seeking, among other relief, a permanent injunction against federal government law enforcement authorities to prevent the use of excessive physical force against journalists who are in places they lawfully have a right to be, and requiring government agents to wear some visible identification. Judge Ellis’s order stated, “after reviewing all the evidence, **the Court finds that Defendants’ widespread misrepresentations call into question everything that Defendants say they are doing** in their characterization of what is happening at the Broadview facility or out in the streets of the Chicagoland area during law enforcement activities.”³³
- *J.G.G. v. Trump*, 1:25-cv-00766 (D.D.C.)—On March 15, 2025, in the wake of President Trump’s Alien Enemies Act proclamation, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (D.D.C) issued a temporary restraining order (TRO) barring the government from deporting suspected Venezuelan gang members to third countries until further action by the Court. That evening, the government nonetheless proceeded to remove “two planeloads of passengers protected by the TRO into a Salvadoran mega-prison.”³⁴ On April 16, 2025, Chief Judge James E. Boasberg issued an order finding that, “**the Government’s actions on that day demonstrate a willful disregard for its Order, sufficient for the Court to conclude that probable cause exists to find the Government in criminal contempt.**”³⁵ Judge Boasberg continued that “**boasts by Defendants intimated that they had defied the Court’s Order deliberately and gleefully;**”³⁶ determined that “what followed in the ensuing days was increasing obstructionism on the part of the Government as it refused to answer basic questions about what had happened;”³⁷ and observed that the government attorneys “provide no convincing reason to avoid **the conclusion that appears obvious from the above factual recitation: that they deliberately flouted this**

³¹ *Id.* at n.2.

³² *Id.* at 6, n.3.

³³ Op. and Order at 13–14, *Chicago Headline Club v. Noem*, 1:25-cv-12173 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 20, 2025), ECF No. 281, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.487571/gov.uscourts.ilnd.487571.281.0_3.pdf.

³⁴ Mem. Op. at 1, *J.G.G. v. Trump*, 1:25-cv-00766 (D.D.C. Apr. 16, 2025), ECF No. 81, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.dcd.278436/gov.uscourts.dcd.278436.81.0_5.pdf.

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ *Id.* at 9.

³⁷ *Id.* at 10.

Court’s written Order and, separately, its oral command that explicitly delineated what compliance entailed.”³⁸

- National Council of Nonprofits v. Office of Management and Budget, 1:25-cv-00239 (D.D.C.)—On January 28, 2025, the Office of Management and Budget issued Memorandum M-25-13, which ordered federal agencies to temporarily pause the disbursement of federal funds relating to programs that could be implicated by President Trump’s executive orders. In an order granting plaintiff’s motion for a TRO against the enforcement of a federal funding freeze, Judge Loren AliKhan wrote of the government’s argument: “Defendants ... protest that such a conclusion ‘would be contrary to the presumption of good faith that courts routinely accord the government when assessing voluntary cessation.’ ... **Here, Defendants’ plea for a presumption of good faith rings hollow when their own actions contradict their representations.**”³⁹
- League of United Latin American Citizens v. Executive Office of The President, 1:25-cv-00946 (D.D.C.), Democratic National Committee v. Trump, 1:25-cv-00952 (D.D.C.), and League of Women Voters Education Fund v. Trump, 1:25-cv-00955 (D.D.C.) (consolidated)—On April 24, 2025, Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly issued an order granting plaintiffs’ motions for preliminary injunctions against Section 2(a) of President Trump’s Executive Order 14248, which directs the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to “take appropriate action” within 30 days to require “documentary proof of United States citizenship” on the national mail voter registration form and to have states record information about what citizenship document was used.⁴⁰ In her order, Judge Kollar-Kotelly called out the DOJ for making key factual misrepresentations in its argument: “**the Court must remark that this exchange does not reflect the level of diligence the Court expects from any litigant—let alone the United States Department of Justice.**”⁴¹

It is this Committee’s duty to investigate this dramatic upsurge in grave misconduct by government attorneys and determine why, under your leadership, DOJ attorneys are misrepresenting facts to federal courts, withholding material information from federal judges, and evading or defying lawful court orders. Accordingly, I request you provide the following records by no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 28, 2026:

1. All communications from the White House to Acting Attorney General Blanche, the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, or any supervisory DOJ attorney in Washington, DC, regarding misrepresentations to

³⁸ *Id.* at 14.

³⁹ Op. and Order at 15, *Nat’l Council of Nonprofits v. Office of Mgmt. & Budget*, 1:25-cv-00239 (D.D.C. Feb. 3, 2025), ECF No. 30, <https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/files/media/documents/2025/dc-order-tro-2-3-2025.pdf>.

⁴⁰ Exec. Order No. 14248, 90 Fed. Reg. 14005 (Mar. 28, 2025).


⁴¹ Mem. Op. at 56 n.9, *League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Exec. Off. of the President*, 1:25-cv-00946 (D.D.C. Apr. 24, 2025), ECF No. 104, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.dcd.279032/gov.uscourts.dcd.279032.104.0_4.pdf.

the courts, possible lack of compliance with court orders, or cases in which the federal bench criticized or brought into question DOJ's candor or good faith since January 20, 2025.

2. All records relating to DOJ Office of Professional Responsibility referrals for attorney misconduct since January 20, 2025, including the disposition of the referral and any reports, depositions, or investigatory records.
3. All communications since January 20, 2025, in which officials in the Office of the Attorney General, Office of the Deputy Attorney General, or any supervisory DOJ attorney in Washington, DC, directed, edited, or approved factual representations, declarations, or certifications made to a federal court in cases enumerated or cited to in this letter.
4. All internal documents and communications from January 20, 2025, from the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, or any supervisory DOJ attorney in Washington, DC, to U.S. Attorney's Offices regarding the expectations of DOJ line attorneys and reporting mechanisms for attorney misconduct.

I look forward to your prompt response to our urgent and important questions.

Very truly yours,


Jamie Raskin
Ranking Member

cc: The Honorable Jim Jordan, Chairman

Mr. M. Sean O'Neill, Acting Inspector General
U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General