APPENDIX to:

**[The International Academy of Trial Lawyers Urges the United States Senate to Delay Confirmation Hearing to Permit Full Review of District Court Findings Regarding President's Lawsuit]**

**Fifteen District Court Findings Congress Should Investigate**

**July 14, 2026**

Set out below, by topic, are the Court findings the Academy urges the United States Senate to address and resolve in any hearing on Mr. Blanche's nomination to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

The House of Representatives should also exercise its oversight authority to investigate the Court's findings about the President.

**The Trump Lawsuit and Settlement Were Collusive.**

1. The lawsuit Mr. Blanche sought to settle on behalf of the United States was "non-adversarial, collusive, and jurisdictionally improper." [1]

2. Because "this fact was so obvious and insurmountable, the Court finds this matter was brought for an improper purpose—to gain the imprimatur of judicial legitimacy for a 'settlement' that had no viable basis in law or fact."[2]

3. After the lawsuit was initially filed, the Department of Justice took no steps to challenge its timeliness or merits, even though it had vigorously litigated both against other, similarly situated taxpayers.[3] Instead, it purported to settle it swiftly, creating an extraordinary $1.776 billion "Anti-Weaponization" fund.

4. An Executive Order issued by President Trump on February 24, 2025 declared that "The President and the Attorney General ***subject to the President's supervision and control***, shall provide authoritative interpretations of law for the executive branch…[and] No employee of the executive branchy acting in their official capacity may advance an interpretation of law as the position of the United States ***that contravenes the President or the Attorney General's opinion on a matter of law including…positions advanced in litigation***…"[4] As a result, the Court found that "In this case, unlike others that private parties have instituted, Defendants and their representatives are ***unable to advance any legal position or interpretation—however legitimate or well-reasoned—contrary to that held by Lead Plaintiff in this matter, President Trump*****.** Not

[1] Opinion at 38
[2] Opinion at 38
[3] Opinion at 23-24.
[4] Opinion at 22.

surprisingly then, no attorney appeared on Defendants' behalf, challenged Plaintiffs' actions, or justified the United States' position in any way."[5]

5. Noting that Article II of the Constitution prohibits conferring benefits or emoluments on the President beyond his authorized salary, the Court observed that "No sitting President has ever sued federal agencies completely subject to his control for monetary benefits, or any benefits that inure to him, his family, and associates. The failure of any attorney in this case to address, on this docket, the relationship of this Article II proscription with the benefits conferred by the 'settlement' is a glaring omission that speaks to the control of the Lead Plaintiff," President Trump.[6]

6. "Another signal that adverseness was absent was Acting Attorney General Blanche's unilateral repudiation and severance of the purported Anti-Weaponization Fund associated with this lawsuit... Acting Attorney General Blanche's decision, which has not been memorialized or adopted by Plaintiffs or their lawyers, demonstrates his confidence that he could speak for, and bind, both sides of this matter. This certitude supports the conclusion that the Parties worked in tandem and were never actually adverse."[7]

**The Settlement was Riddled with Conflicts of Interest.**

7. The "settlement agreement" is signed on behalf of the Defendants by Stanley Woodward, Jr., the current Associate Attorney General at the DOJ, and acting Attorney General Blanche. Before he went to the DOJ, Associate Attorney Woodward represented several individuals charged in connection with the events of January 6, 2021, at the United States Capitol. He also represented Walt Nauta, who was President Trump's personal aide and a co-defendant in the criminal matter involving the return of classified documents."[8]

8. "Before his appointment to the DOJ, Acting Attorney General Blanche served as President Trump's personal criminal defense attorney in several high-profile matters."

9. "While the Court appreciates that attorneys successfully transition between private practice and government service, such transitions do not absolve counsel of their ethical obligations…As relevant here, Rule 4-1.11 of the Rules Regulating the Florida Bar provides a conflict-of-interest rule which specifically7 governs former and current government officers and employees. The commentary to this rule explains…'A lawyer should not be in a position where benefit to the

[5] Opinion at 23.
[6] Opinion at 35.
[7] Opinion at 36.
[8] Opinion at 31.

other client might affect performance of the lawyer's professional functions on behalf of the government.' The spectre of that risk seems to be present here."[9]

10. "The gravamen of the 'settlement agreement' is to fund claims premised on events including those arising from…the Mar-a-Lago Documents Case and the events of January 6, 2021. Indeed, these two cases have been referenced as quintessential Anti-Weaponization and Lawfare claims. Instead of either recusing because of their previous representations or vigorously defending this lawsuit as required to do so by DOJ policies and procedures, these lawyers agreed to a settlement involving staggering amounts of money potentially benefitting former clients."[10]

**The Settlement Improperly Sought to Immunize the President from Tax Investigations.**

11. Mr. Blanche also signed a "Release Order," which "extends a blanket grant of immunity to all Plaintiffs and their families and affiliates, and precludes all 'current or possible' investigations or actions before any other agencies or departments. The Release Order also purports to bar the IRS from conducting any future tax audits of President Trump, his sons, and their entities. This provision directly contravenes 26 U.S.C. §7217, titled 'Prohibition on executive branch influence over taxpayer audits and other investigations…[11]

12. "The explicit text of this statute prohibits President Trump and his lawyers—one of whom was former White House Counsel—from asking for or promoting termination of an audit directed toward him. And acquiescing to any such demand is wholly incompatible with the duties of the DOJ attorneys …to enforce the law and protect the public interest." [12]

**The Court Found these Actions Warrant Sanctions and Disciplinary Referrals.**

13. "The conduct of the Parties triggers the Cout's inherent authority [to impose sanctions]. As to Plaintiffs, they filed a multibillion-dollar lawsuit asserting claims that they knew, or should have known, were time-barred and for an amount of damages unsupported by facts or law. Plaintiffs could make no connection between the billions of dollars they sought, and the [$1,000 per violation] recovery authorized under the statute….This lawsuit was not brought to vindicate rights; it was brought to manipulate the judicial process to pursue benefits unavailable in litigation because the Parties were not adverse." [13]

---

[9] Opinion at 32 (quoting Fl. Rule 4-1.11 and citing similar principles of law in other jurisdictions).
[10] Opinion at 33-34
[11] Opinion at 34 (*quoting* the statute which states: 'It shall be unlawful for any applicable person to request, directly or indirectly, any officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service to conduct or terminate an audit or any other investigation of any particular taxpayer with respect to the tax liability of such taxpayer…").
[12] Opinion at 34.
[13] Opinion at 50.

14. "Defendants' conduct is equally untenable. It is telling that the DOJ, which is tasked with enforcement of United States law, has remained conspicuously absent and silent when serious questions about this matter have been raised. And when representatives did choose to expound on the Department's conduct, they offered misleading explanations of the facts and the law. In abdicating its responsibility to zealously defend the interests of the United States, the Government entered into a 'settlement' that deviated from its litigation posture in similar actions, disregarded DOJ policies, and accomplished objectives beyond those authorized as well as those specifically prohibited, by law. Under these circumstances, the Court may reasonably infer that the Government failed to defend this lawsuit or to respond to the Court's jurisdictional inquiry because its position would not withstand judicial scrutiny and because resolution of the threshold issues identified by the Court would not have favored its preferred outcome in this case."[14]

15. "Finally, the Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Order to the State Bar of New York, of which Acting Attorney General Blanche is a member, **AND** to the District of Columbia Bar, of which Associate Attorney General Woodward is a member, where disciplinary proceedings are currently ongoing."[15]

Return to the International Academy of Trial Lawyers **Academy Statements page**

[14] Opinion at 51.
[15] Opinion at 54.