

June 9, 2026

The Honorable John Thune
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Chuck Schumer
Minority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Mike Johnson
Speaker
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Hakeem Jeffries
Minority Leader
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Re: Congressional action still urgently needed on *Trump v. IRS*

Dear Leader Thune, Leader Schumer, Speaker Johnson and Leader Jeffries:

We, the undersigned organizations, write to urge continued and urgent congressional action in response to President Trump's unprecedented filing and settlement of claims against his own administration in *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service* (IRS).¹ Congress should not be deterred from action by the administration's recent claim that it is not moving forward with the settlement's slush fund in the face of broad bipartisan outrage. Instead, Congress must immediately legislate to fully bar implementation of this settlement and to limit conflicted lawsuits and settlements by this and future presidents.

The administration's confusing and inconsistent positions on whether the settlement's slush fund has been completely abandoned underscore the necessity of legislation. On June 1, the administration stated that the Department of Justice would simply "abide by the Court's ruling" in *Floyd v. Department of Justice*,² which temporarily enjoined "any further action pursuant to the creation or operation of

¹ See *Pres. Donald J. Trump v. Internal Revenue Serv.*, No. 1:26-cv-20609 (S.D. Fla., filed Jan. 29, 2026).

² U.S. Department of Justice (@TheJusticeDept), X (June 1, 2026, 3:32 PM), <https://x.com/TheJusticeDept/status/2061531380735951193>.

the Anti-Weaponization Fund[.]”³ On June 2, acting Attorney General Blanche testified before Congress that the administration is “not moving forward with the fund” created under the settlement, although he refused to “commit[] to putting anything in writing.”⁴ That same day, Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward Jr. publicly affirmed that the Department would work to recreate the slush fund through the Federal Tort Claims Act, before later backtracking his statement.⁵ The following day, on June 3, President Trump denied having “dropped” the slush fund, saying only, “A court ruled against it. . . . And I think [people] should be reimbursed for a crooked government.”⁶ On June 5, the Department of Justice opposed plaintiffs’ motions to temporarily enjoin the slush fund in court, while citing Attorney General Blanche’s testimony before Congress to claim that the weaponization fund is “not going forward.”⁷ Two days later, President Trump stated that he “[doesn’t] know what is going to happen with the weaponization fund” and that he would “be disappointed” if “they don’t get it approved.”⁸ In light of the administration’s changing statements and hesitation to fully and permanently abandon the slush fund, Congress must legislate to ensure it cannot move forward.

The administration has further confirmed that it will still pursue some of the settlement’s most egregious terms. Acting Attorney General Blanche testified before Congress that “nothing has changed” regarding the administration’s plans to implement terms beyond the slush fund, including the May 19 order limiting future audits and investigations of the president, his family members and his affiliates.⁹ That order goes far beyond an ordinary settlement of claims brought in, or related to, the underlying case. It not only bars all audits and tax-related probes that were available or pending against the president, his family or his affiliates before the settlement date, but further “releases, waives, acquits, and forever discharges . . . **any and all claims**” that “have been or could have been” asserted by the defendants on the wholly unrelated topics of “Lawfare and/or Weaponization” and “any matters

³ *Floyd v. Dep’t of Justice*, No. 1:26-cv-1399, 2026 WL 1504001, at *1 (E.D. Va. May 29, 2026).

⁴ *Oversight Hearing - Department of Justice Before the H. Comm. on Appropriations Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee* 40:32, 1:42:40, 119th Cong. (2026) (testimony of acting Attorney General Todd Blanche), <https://appropriations.house.gov/schedule/hearings/oversight-hearing-department-justice-0>.

⁵ See Jarrell Dillard et al., *Senators from both parties oppose payout fund as funding package advances*, Wash. Post (June 3, 2026), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2026/06/03/senate-lawmakers-strongly-oppose-payout-fund-difficult-votes-loom/>; Alexander Mallin, *Top DOJ official deletes post suggesting alternate plan for compensating alleged ‘weaponization’ victims*, ABC News (June 3, 2026), <https://abcnews.com/Politics/top-doj-official-deletes-post-suggesting-alternate-plan/story?id=133547940>; see also Lindsey Graham (@LindseyGrahamSC), X (June 2, 2026, 6:39 PM), <https://x.com/LindseyGrahamSC/status/2061940734081528087>.

⁶ Pod Force One with Miranda Devine and New York Post, *Donald Trump Unleashed: Bibi, “Are You Effing Crazy?!”* 40:33 (YouTube, June 3, 2026), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SLnB5l1PxCY>.

⁷ Defendants’ Response to Plaintiff’s Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order at 2, *CREW v. Dep’t of Justice*, No. 1:26-cv-01789 (D.D.C. Jun. 5, 2026), ECF No. 15; Defendants’ Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order at 2, *Floyd v. Dep’t of Justice*, No. 1:26-cv-01399 (E.D. Va. Jun. 5, 2026), ECF No. 62.

⁸ NBC News, *Meet the Press Full Episode - June 7 37:37, 35:37* (YouTube, June 7, 2026), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4EusZcKt5fs>.

⁹ *Oversight Hearing - Department of Justice*, *supra* n. 4 at 53:00; see also Order, Office of the Attorney Gen. (May 19, 2026), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/media/1441216/dl>.

currently pending or that could be pending” otherwise.¹⁰ As members of Congress have acknowledged, this agreement shields President Trump and his inner circle from the everyday tax scrutiny applied to other Americans.¹¹ Worse still, through this collusive agreement with his own administration, the president has granted himself and his inner circle extraordinary immunity from legal actions with no relation at all to the claims in *Trump v. IRS*. Congress must not condone the president’s efforts to immunize and enrich himself, his family and his affiliates. Congress must legislate to stop this unprecedented and self-serving arrangement from moving forward.

Members of both parties have publicly acknowledged the fundamental problems presented by the *Trump v. IRS* settlement.¹² We applaud all of the members who have introduced legislation to limit the settlement’s harmful impacts, including Representatives Fitzpatrick, Fletcher, Raskin, Suozzi and Thompson and Senators Kelly, Schiff, Slotkin, Schumer and Wyden.¹³ But now is not the time to rest.

Congress must immediately move forward with legislation that not only prohibits the terms of this settlement—the slush fund and the immunity provisions alike—but also addresses future conflicts by prohibiting a sitting president from suing his own administration and collecting damages from it during his term in office. Further, Congress must investigate to determine whether the administration’s extraordinary grant of self-immunity violates existing law and to identify any legal gaps to be filled through legislation.¹⁴ To do nothing in the face of the current administration’s collusive conduct is to invite the recurrence of these same harms.

¹⁰ See Order, *supra* n.9 (emphasis added).

¹¹ See, e.g., Chris Strohm, *Trump to Get Audit Immunity as \$1.8 Billion Fund in Doubt*, Bloomberg (June 2, 2026), <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2026-06-02/trump-to-get-audit-immunity-even-as-1-8-billion-fund-in-doubt?srnd=undefined> (“Senator Thom Tillis, a Republican from North Carolina, said the audit provision is ‘another thing’ about the settlement that gives him pause . . . ‘How can you not at least have [Trump family members] subjected to the same thing I’m subjected to and every one of you?’”); see also *id.* (“Republican Senator John Curtis of Utah said the audit immunity is ‘part of the problem’ with the settlement deal. ‘I need it dead, dead,’ Curtis added.”).

¹² See *id.*; Dillard, *supra* n.5 (“Sen. John Cornyn echoed similar concerns regarding the fund, sharing a . . . Wall Street Journal editorial that urged Congress to block the fund entirely. The post stated: ‘The way to ensure the Trump retribution fund is more than mostly dead would be for Congress to put a stake through it.’”); Sarah Ferris et al., *Trump tells CNN he doesn’t know if \$1.8 billion fund is dead, calling it ‘a beautiful thing’*, CNN (June 3, 2026), <https://www.cnn.com/2026/06/03/politics/anti-weaponization-fund-trump> (quoting Sen. Cassidy, “I want to make sure it’s not mostly dead, that it is truly dead.”).

¹³ See Bipartisan Transparency for American Taxpayers Act, H.R. 8955, 119th Cong. (2026); No Presidential Self-Serving Lawsuits Act of 2026, H.R. 8968, 119th Cong. (2026); No Taxpayer-Funded Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2026, H.R. 8914, 119th Cong. (2026); SLUSH FUND Act of 2026, H.R. 8910, 119th Cong. (2026); Drain the Slush Fund Act, S. 4644, 119th Cong. (2026); SLUSH FUND Act of 2026, S. 4616, 119th Cong. (2026).

¹⁴ See, e.g., Brandon DeBot et al., *What Congress Should Do About the President’s Sweetheart Deal in Trump v. IRS*, Just Security (June 2, 2026), <https://www.justsecurity.org/140939/congress-block-deal-trump-irs/>.

Sincerely,

Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington
Clean Elections Texas
Common Cause
Court Accountability Action
Demand Progress
Democracy Defenders Action
End Citizens United
Free Speech For People
Greenpeace USA
MOVI, Money Out Voters In
National Women's Law Center Action Fund
People For the American Way
Project On Government Oversight
Public Citizen
Secure Elections Network
Transparency International U.S.
Voices for Progress
The Workers Circle