DEMOCRACY FORWARD

August 3, 2026

Via Electronic Mail

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of the Associate Attorney General
Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward
Deputy Associate Attorney General John Adams
Deputy Associate Attorney General Micah Fielden
Senior Counsel Andrew Block
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington DC 20530-0001

Re: Floyd v. DOJ, No. 1:26-cv-1399-LMB (E.D. Va.)

Dear Mr. Woodward, Mr. Adams, Mr. Fielden, and Mr. Block,

We write regarding statements the Department, through the Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, made to the public last evening and today regarding the status of the "Anti-Weaponization Fund" that the Department created through a collusive agreement in *Trump v. IRS*[1] and that this Court has blocked as unlawful. While seeking to have the public believe that the Anti-Weaponization Fund is not going forward, we note that the Acting Attorney General has still refused to provide a sworn statement under penalty of perjury to the Court that the Department of Justice and/or the Department of Treasury "will not take any action to create or operate the Anti-Weaponization Fund, and that the Anti Weaponization Fund will not proceed in any manner, or under any name," ECF No. 85.

Repeated public statements by the President that the Fund may operate in the future as well as contradicting statements by the Department, through the Acting Attorney General, are, in addition to being of grave public concern, directly relevant to our clients' legal rights and remedies and to the positions the Department has taken in this matter. **We ask that you respond as soon as possible but, in any event no later than 5 pm ET today, to this correspondence so that we may fully evaluate our clients' legal options, including as to amendment of the existing complaint.**

***

[1] *Trump v. IRS*, No. 1:26-cv-20609, 2026 WL 2015525, at *15-16 (S.D. Fla. July 13, 2026).

We became aware through the Acting Attorney General's overnight social media post on X.com that he has purported to rescind his May 18, 2026 Order establishing the Anti-Weaponization Fund by stating that the Fund "is" not currently "operative."[2] But the Acting Attorney General's post does not confirm in a sworn statement under penalty of perjury to the Court that "the Anti-Weaponization Fund will not proceed in any manner, or under any name," as required by the Court's order, ECF No. 85; or that the parties to the collusive *Trump v. IRS* agreement[3] that created the Fund have made a binding amendment to that agreement. The Acting Attorney General himself stated in his confirmation proceedings before Congress that plaintiffs in *Trump v. IRS* could still enforce the contract's terms absent such an amendment.[4] As a result of these deficiencies, the Department and other parties to the *Trump v. IRS* agreement can attempt to resurrect the Fund at any time.

The President, who is a named plaintiff in *Trump v. IRS*, has made clear that he intends to keep the Fund alive, affirming his belief that the January 6 rioters and other Fund beneficiaries "should be paid back for what they were forced to endure."[5] And the Acting Attorney General's public statements last night and today do not address or repudiate the President's statements over the weekend that the Fund may be operational in the future. For all intents and purposes, despite the Acting Attorney General's efforts to have the public and lawmakers believe otherwise, it appears that the Anti-Weaponization Fund is as viable today as it was the day it was created.

Rather than confirming a repudiation of the collusive agreement in *Trump v. IRS*, the Department's statement raises more questions than it answers. In addition to the questions it raises regarding the Fund, it also shows that the Department remains committed to releasing all of President Trump, his sons', and his companies' previous tax liability, including terminating all existing audits and prohibiting new audits of past conduct, another key component of the *Trump v. IRS* agreement (the Immunity Order).[6] This, combined with Acting Attorney General Blanche's

---

[2] Acting AG Todd Blanche (@DAGToddBlanche), X (Aug. 3, 2026, 3:09 AM), https://perma.cc/GM36-GRSC; https://perma.cc/WAZ9-9TQX.

[3] *Trump v. IRS*, No. 26-20609-CV, 2026 WL 2015525, at *17 (S.D. Fla. July 13, 2026).

[4] Associated Press, *Todd Blanche testifies at confirmation hearing to be attorney general*, at 1:12:01 (YouTube, July 15, 2026), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=763ZT4sVSys.

[5] Pres. Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump), Truth Social (July 30, 2026, 11:15 AM), https://perma.cc/FK7Y-SK6U; Pres. Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump), Truth Social (July 31, 2026, 7:03 AM), https://perma.cc/RM9D-66DQ; Acyn (@Acyn), X (Aug. 2, 2026, at 10:34 PM), https://x.com/acyn/status/2084045272599146589?s=46, https://perma.cc/5RW5-QD2Z.

[6] The statement also does not resolve the fundamental illegality of the May 19 Immunity Order, which violates the Internal Revenue Code's prohibition on White House interference with tax audits, 26 U.S.C. § 7217, and constitutes an unconstitutional emolument to President Trump, as identified by the Judge in the *Trump v. IRS* case. *See Trump v. IRS*, No. 1:26-cv-20609, 2026 WL 2015525, at *15-16 (S.D. Fla. July 13, 2026).

previous acknowledgment that the *Trump v. IRS* plaintiffs could sue for breach of contract, shows that neither the agreement, nor the agency actions that resulted from it, including the Immunity Order and the Fund, are truly dead.

***

As our clients weigh all their legal options, additional information is needed given the Department's public statements regarding this matter. Accordingly, by 5 pm ET today, please respond with Defendants' answers to the following questions:

1. Will Defendants, including Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, file "a declaration under the penalty of perjury that they will not take any action to create or operate the Anti-Weaponization Fund, and that the Anti Weaponization Fund will not proceed in any manner, or under any name," ECF No. 85, as previously requested by the Court in this case?
2. Have Defendants secured a written agreement from the parties in *Trump v. IRS* amending the agreement that created the Anti-Weaponization Fund, such that the written amendment also rescinds the creation of the Fund?
3. Does the Immunity Order still require the IRS to terminate any existing audits and to refrain from starting any audits for past tax years for Donald Trump, Donald Trump, Jr., Eric Trump, and the Trump Organization, including "418 Trump Entities" affiliated with the Trump Organization? *See* Compl. ¶ 84, *Trump v. IRS*, No. 1:26-cv-20609-KMW (S.D. Fla.) (Dkt. 1).
4. What is the impact of the August 2 statement regarding the Immunity Order on agencies other than the Department of Justice? Have agencies other than Treasury and IRS dropped or intend to drop investigations into conduct that occurred before May 18, 2026, for the named plaintiffs or "related or affiliated individuals (including, without limitation, family or others filing jointly), or parties including trusts, parent, sister, or related companies, affiliates, and subsidiaries"?

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

/s Pooja A. Boisture
Pooja A. Boisture
Jyoti Jasrasaria
Aman George
Ayesha Khan
Robin F. Thurston
Skye L. Perryman

Telephone: (202) 448-9090
Democracy Forward Foundation
P.O. Box 34553
Washington, D.C. 20043

Counsel for Plaintiffs