



HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

DEMOCRATS | RANKING MEMBER JAMIE RASKIN

OPPOSE H.R. 1526, THE SO-CALLED “NO ROGUE RULINGS ACT OF 2025”

House Republicans Want to Change How the Legal System Works Because Trump Keeps Losing in Court

- H.R. 1526, the “No Rouge Rulings Act of 2025,” limits injunctive relief issued by any federal district court judge to the parties involved in the underlying case, *even if the policy under review has nationwide effects*. **This bill would prevent federal district court judges from being able to provide nationwide relief even when an executive order, policy, or action violates people’s constitutional rights and freedoms.**
- House Republicans are claiming “rogue judges” and certain legal remedies are to blame for Donald Trump’s record of losing in court. The truth is far less complicated: **Donald Trump is losing in court because he keeps trying to do unlawful and unconstitutional things.**
- Injunctions allow judges to stop a litigant from continuing to harm the opposing party or to prevent the government from implementing a challenged policy. When an entire class of people are harmed by an unconstitutional executive order, for example, judges can issue an injunction blocking the enforcement of the executive order while the case makes its way through the courts. **Without this power, the Administration could continue to violate the rights of everyone other than the people who filed the lawsuit.**
- Our Constitution depends on an independent judicial branch to serve as a check on the executive branch, to prevent presidential overreach and to protect the rights and freedoms of Americans. **H.R. 1526 is explicitly designed to prevent the judicial branch from appropriately constraining or halting Donald Trump’s unconstitutional or unlawful actions and policies.** H.R. 1526 would stop federal judges from doing their duty.
- **Since taking office, Donald Trump has issued more than 100 [executive orders](#), some of which have been found to be blatantly unconstitutional or unlawful by federal judges from across the ideological spectrum.** These judges—who were appointed by Republican and Democratic presidents—have granted injunctive relief to prevent some executive orders from going into effect.
- **Judges have appropriately issued “nationwide” injunctions in only the most egregious cases.** Of the nearly 160 cases challenging the Trump Administration’s actions in courts across the country, judges have granted almost [70 injunctions](#) so far. Yet, as of March 27, only [17 cases](#) involve a *nationwide* injunction.
- **Republicans had no objection to nationwide injunctions when courts blocked President Biden’s actions** on immigration, climate change, and student loan debt relief. We heard no accusations of judges frustrating the president’s agenda from Republicans then. This newfound GOP concern over the use of injunctions only appeared when federal judges began ruling against Donald Trump’s extreme agenda.
- **H.R. 1526 contains a curious exception that appears to benefit Republican-led litigation.** This bill provides that when two or more states located in different circuits collectively sue the federal government, a panel of three judges could still impose a nationwide injunction. This carefully drafted exception appears to privilege cases like the ongoing litigation in *Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine v. FDA*, which is now led by three Republican states (Idaho, Missouri, and Kansas) in different federal circuits seeking to rescind the FDA’s approval of the abortion drug mifepristone. Under the exception, the states could still win a nationwide injunction even if H.R. 1526 is signed into law.