

119TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 415

Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 15, 2025

Mr. GREEN of Texas submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

RESOLUTION

Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors.

1 *Resolved*, That Donald John Trump, President of the
2 United States, is unfit to be President, unfit to represent
3 the American values of decency and morality, respect-
4 ability and civility, honesty and propriety, reputability and
5 integrity, is unfit to defend the ideals that have made
6 America great, is unfit to defend liberty and justice for
7 all as extolled in the Pledge of Allegiance, is unfit to de-
8 fend the American ideal of all persons being created equal
9 as exalted in the Declaration of Independence, is unfit to
10 ensure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare

1 and to ensure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our
2 posterity as lauded in the preamble to the United States
3 Constitution, is unfit to protect government of the people,
4 by the people, for the people as elucidated in the Gettys-
5 burg Address, and is impeached for high crimes and mis-
6 demeanors, that the following Article of Impeachment be
7 exhibited to the United States Senate:

8 Article of Impeachment exhibited by the House of
9 Representatives of the United States of America, in the
10 name of itself, and of the people of the United States of
11 America, against Donald John Trump, President of the
12 United States of America, in maintenance and support of
13 its impeachment against him for high crimes and mis-
14 demeanors committed as President of the United States
15 constituting harm to American society to the manifest in-
16 jury of the people of the United States of America.

17 ARTICLE I

18
19 Devolving democracy within the United States into
20 authoritarianism with himself (Donald John Trump) as
21 an authoritarian President. Merriam-Webster defines
22 authoritarianism as, “relating to, or favoring a concentra-
23 tion of power in a leader or an elite not constitutionally
24 responsible to the people”.

25 The Constitution provides that the House of Rep-
26 resentatives “shall have the sole Power of Impeachment”

1 and that the President “shall be removed from Office on
2 Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or
3 other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.” In his conduct
4 while President of the United States—and in violation of
5 his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of
6 President of the United States and, to the best of his abil-
7 ity, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the
8 United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty
9 to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—Donald
10 John Trump engaged in high Crimes and Misdemeanors,
11 causing the devolution of democracy within the United
12 States of America into authoritarianism with himself as
13 an authoritarian President.

14 Early in his campaign, President Trump indicated his
15 dictatorial/authoritarian intentions. On December 5,
16 2023, Fox News aired a town hall interview hosted by
17 Sean Hannity with then-candidate, Donald Trump, where
18 he was asked, “Under no circumstances, you are prom-
19 ising America tonight, you would never abuse power as
20 retribution against anybody,” to which, Trump replied,
21 “Except for day one.” In speaking to the audience,
22 Trump, referring to Hannity, said, “We love this guy. He
23 says you’re not going to be a dictator, are you? I said,
24 no, no, no. Other than day one. We’re closing the border

1 and we're drilling, drilling, drilling. After that, I'm not
2 a dictator. Okay?"

3 Unfortunately, President Trump's authoritarianism
4 did not end on day one, but instead continued through
5 condoning the undermining of the judicial independence
6 of the Federal judiciary, disregarding the separation of
7 powers, violating the due process clause in the Fifth
8 Amendment of the United States Constitution, deni-
9 grating Federal judges, condoning the flouting of orders
10 of United States Federal Courts, including orders of the
11 United States Supreme Court, in that:

12 On Wednesday, April 16, 2025, James E. Boasberg,
13 Chief Judge United States District Court for the District
14 of Columbia found that probable cause existed to hold the
15 Trump Administration defendants in contempt for a will-
16 ful disregard for its order. The relevant part of the Memo-
17 randum Opinion stated as follows:

18 (1) "On the evening of Saturday, March 15,
19 2025, this Court issued a written Temporary Re-
20 straining Order [TRO] barring the Government
21 from transferring certain individuals into foreign
22 custody pursuant to the Alien Enemies Act. At the
23 time the Order issued, those individuals were on
24 planes being flown overseas, having been spirited out
25 of the United States by the Government before they

1 could vindicate their due-process rights by contesting
2 their removability in a Federal court, as the law re-
3 quires . . . Rather than comply with the Court’s
4 Order, the Government continued the hurried re-
5 moval operation. Early on Sunday morning—hours
6 after the Order issued—it transferred two
7 planeloads of passengers protected by the TRO into
8 a Salvadoran mega-prison”.

9 (2) “As this Opinion will detail, the Court ulti-
10 mately determines that the Government’s actions on
11 that day [March 16, 2025] demonstrate a willful dis-
12 regard for its Order, sufficient for the Court to con-
13 clude that probable cause exists to find the Govern-
14 ment in criminal contempt. The Court does not
15 reach such conclusion lightly or hastily; indeed, it
16 has given Defendants ample opportunity to rectify or
17 explain their actions. None of their responses has
18 been satisfactory.”

19 (3) “One might nonetheless ask how this in-
20 quiry into compliance is able to proceed at all given
21 that the Supreme Court vacated the TRO after the
22 events in question. That Court’s later determination
23 that the TRO suffered from a legal defect, however,
24 does not excuse the Government’s violation. Instead,
25 it is a foundational legal precept that every judicial

1 order ‘must be obeyed’—no matter how ‘erroneous’
2 it ‘may be’—until a court reverses it.”

3 (4) “If a party chooses to disobey the order—
4 rather than wait for it to be reversed through the ju-
5 dicial process—such disobedience is punishable as
6 contempt, notwithstanding any later-revealed defi-
7 ciencies in the order . . . That foundational ‘rule of
8 law’ answers not just how this compliance inquiry
9 can proceed, but why it must.”

10 (5) “The rule ‘reflects a belief that in the fair
11 administration of justice no man can be judge in his
12 own case,’ no matter how ‘exalted his station’ or
13 ‘righteous his motives.’”

14 (6) “The Constitution does not tolerate willful
15 disobedience of judicial orders—especially by offi-
16 cials of a coordinate branch who have sworn an oath
17 to uphold it. To permit such officials to freely ‘annul
18 the judgments of the courts of the United States’
19 would not just ‘destroy the rights acquired under
20 those judgments’; it would make ‘a solemn mockery’
21 of ‘the constitution itself.’”

22 (7) “‘So fatal a result must be deprecated by
23 all.’”

24 (8) “For the foregoing reasons, the Court will
25 find probable cause that Defendants’ actions con-

1 stitute contempt. It will provide them an opportunity
2 to purge such contempt. If they opt not to do so, the
3 Court will proceed to identify the contemnor(s) and
4 refer the matter for prosecution. A separate Order
5 so stating will issue this day.”

6 On March 18, 2025, President Trump published a
7 statement denigrating and calling for the impeachment of
8 a judge. In relevant part, the statement averred as follows:

9 (1) “This Radical Left Lunatic of a Judge, a
10 troublemaker and agitator who was sadly appointed
11 by Barack Hussein Obama, was not elected Presi-
12 dent.”

13 (2) “This judge, like many of the Crooked
14 Judges’ I am forced to appear before, should be IM-
15 PEACHED!!!”

16 On March 18, 2025, NPR published an article re-
17 lated to the President of the United States of America,
18 reporting on the President’s call for a judge to be im-
19 peached. In relevant part, the article stated as follows:

20 (1) “Without naming James Boasberg, the
21 chief judge of the district court of Washington, DC,
22 Trump said, ‘This judge, like many of the Crooked
23 Judges’ I am forced to appear before, should be IM-
24 PEACHED!!!’ He also called Boasberg a ‘Radical
25 Left Lunatic of a Judge, a troublemaker and agita-

1 tor who was sadly appointed by Barack Hussein
2 Obama.’”

3 (2) “Reacting to the President’s social media
4 post, Chief Justice John Roberts issued a written
5 statement of his own: ‘For more than two centuries
6 it has been established that impeachment is not an
7 appropriate response to disagreements concerning a
8 judicial decision. The normal appellate review proc-
9 ess exists for that purpose’.”

10 On April 10, 2025, the Supreme Court issued opinion
11 No. 24A949 regarding the Trump Administration’s re-
12 quest to vacate an injunction issued by the U.S. District
13 Court for the District of Maryland.

14 The court’s unanimous judgment and reasoning in
15 opinion No. 24A949 (available for perusal), in relevant
16 part, stated:

17 (1) “On March 15, 2025, the United States re-
18 moved Kilmar Armando Abrego Garcia from the
19 United States to El Salvador, where he is currently
20 detained in the Center for Terrorism Confinement
21 (CECOT). The United States acknowledges that
22 Abrego Garcia was subject to a withholding order
23 forbidding his removal to El Salvador, and that the
24 removal to El Salvador was therefore illegal. The

1 United States represents that the removal to El Sal-
2 vador was the result of an ‘administrative error’.”

3 (2) “The [United States District Court for the
4 District of Maryland’s] order properly requires the
5 Government to ‘facilitate’ Abrego Garcia’s release
6 from custody in El Salvador and to ensure that his
7 case is handled as it would have been had he not
8 been improperly sent to El Salvador.”

9 Further in the statement of Justice Sotomayor, with
10 whom Justice Kagan and Justice Jackson join, respecting
11 the Court’s disposition of the application averred that:

12 (1) “The United States Government arrested
13 Kilmar Armando Abrego Garcia in Maryland and
14 flew him to a ‘terrorism confinement center’ in El
15 Salvador, where he has been detained for 26 days
16 and counting. To this day, the Government has cited
17 no basis in law for Abrego Garcia’s warrantless ar-
18 rest, his removal to El Salvador, or his confinement
19 in a Salvadoran prison. Nor could it. The Govern-
20 ment remains bound by an Immigration Judge’s
21 2019 order expressly prohibiting Abrego Garcia’s re-
22 moval to El Salvador because he faced a ‘clear prob-
23 ability of future persecution’ there and ‘dem-
24 onstrated that [El Salvador’s] authorities were and
25 would be unable or unwilling to protect him.’”

1 (2) “The Government has not challenged the
2 validity of that order. Instead of hastening to correct
3 its egregious error, the Government dismissed it as
4 an ‘oversight.’”

5 (3) “The Government’s argument, moreover,
6 implies that it could deport and incarcerate any per-
7 son, including U.S. citizens, without legal con-
8 sequence, so long as it does so before a court can
9 intervene.”

10 On April 14, 2025, days after the Supreme Court
11 issued the above opinion No. 24A949, in a meeting with
12 President Nayib Bukele of El Salvador, Attorney General
13 Pamela Bondi, Secretary of State Marco Rubio, and White
14 House Deputy Chief of Staff Stephen Miller—President
15 Donald Trump was present and condoned their untruthful
16 statements opposing the courts opinion related to Abrego
17 Garcia’s removal from the United States and the Supreme
18 Court’s order to facilitate his return. The meeting was re-
19 corded by C-SPAN. In the meeting, President Trump
20 condoned and defended the untruths that undermine the
21 Fifth Amendment mandate of due process prior to the re-
22 moval of citizens and non-citizens from the United States
23 of America.

24 C-SPAN reported the following: “President Trump
25 Meets with President of El Salvador: During an Oval Of-

1 fice meeting with Salvadoran President Nayib Bukele,
2 President Donald Trump and members of his administra-
3 tion argued they were not required to return deported Sal-
4 vadoran citizen Kilmar Abrego Garcia to the United
5 States, in spite of the Supreme Court ruling in favor of
6 facilitating his return. President Bukele himself said that
7 he was not authorized to return Mr. Garcia, who was le-
8 gally present in the U.S. before being deported in March.
9 The Trump administration alleged that he was a member
10 of the MS-13 gang, but it previously admitted that the
11 deportation was an ‘administrative error.’”

12 On April 17, 2025, days after the White House meet-
13 ing referenced above, the United States Court of Appeals
14 for the Fourth Circuit rendered an order exposing, with
15 meticulous explication, the untruths utilized—by Attorney
16 General Pamela Bondi, Secretary of State Marco Rubio,
17 White House Deputy Chief of Staff Stephen Miller, and
18 condoned by President Donald Trump—to deny due proc-
19 ess mandated in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

20 Wilkinson, Circuit Judge of the United States Court
21 of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, with whom Circuit
22 Judges King and Thacker join, stated in relevant part as
23 follows:

24 (1) “It is difficult in some cases to get to the
25 very heart of the matter. But in this case, it is not

1 hard at all. The government is asserting a right to
2 stash away residents of this country in foreign pris-
3 ons without the semblance of due process that is the
4 foundation of our constitutional order. Further, it
5 claims in essence that because it has rid itself of
6 custody that there is nothing that can be done. This
7 should be shocking not only to judges, but to the in-
8 tuitive sense of liberty that Americans far removed
9 from courthouses still hold dear. The government as-
10 serts that Abrego Garcia is a terrorist and a mem-
11 ber of MS-13. Perhaps, but perhaps not. Regard-
12 less, he is still entitled to due process. If the govern-
13 ment is confident of its position, it should be as-
14 sured that position will prevail in proceedings to ter-
15 minate the withholding of removal order . . . More-
16 over, the government has conceded that Abrego Gar-
17 cia was wrongly or ‘mistakenly’ deported. Why then
18 should it not make what was wrong, right?”

19 (2) “The Supreme Court’s decision does not,
20 however, allow the government to do essentially
21 nothing. It requires the government ‘to “facilitate”
22 Abrego Garcia’s release from custody in El Salvador
23 and to ensure that his case is handled as it would
24 have been had he not been improperly sent to El
25 Salvador.’ . . . ‘Facilitate’ is an active verb. It re-

1 quires that steps be taken as the Supreme Court has
2 made perfectly clear.”

3 (3) “‘Facilitation’ does not permit the admit-
4 tedly erroneous deportation of an individual to the
5 one country’s prisons that the withholding order for-
6 bids and, further, to do so in disregard of a court
7 order that the government not so subtly spurns. ‘Fa-
8 cilitation’ does not sanction the abrogation of habeas
9 corpus through the transfer of custody to foreign de-
10 tention centers in the manner attempted here. Allow-
11 ing all this would ‘facilitate’ foreign detention more
12 than it would domestic return. It would reduce the
13 rule of law to lawlessness and tarnish the very val-
14 ues for which Americans of diverse views and per-
15 suasions have always stood.”

16 (4) “If today the Executive claims the right to
17 deport without due process and in disregard of court
18 orders, what assurance will there be tomorrow that
19 it will not deport American citizens and then dis-
20 claim responsibility to bring them home? And what
21 assurance shall there be that the Executive will not
22 train its broad discretionary powers upon its political
23 enemies? The threat, even if not the actuality, would
24 always be present, and the Executive’s obligation to

1 ‘take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed’
2 would lose its meaning.”

3 (5) “Today, both the United States and the El
4 Salvadoran governments disclaim any authority and/
5 or responsibility to return Abrego Garcia. See Presi-
6 dent Trump Participates in a Bilateral Meeting with
7 the President of El Salvador, WHITE HOUSE
8 (Apr. 14, 2025). We are told that neither govern-
9 ment has the power to act. The result will be to
10 leave matters generally and Abrego Garcia specifi-
11 cally in an interminable limbo without recourse to
12 law of any sort.”

13 (6) “Now the branches come too close to grind-
14 ing irrevocably against one another in a conflict that
15 promises to diminish both. This is a losing propo-
16 sition all around. The Judiciary will lose much from
17 the constant intimations of its illegitimacy, to which
18 by dint of custom and detachment we can only spar-
19 ingly reply. The Executive will lose much from a
20 public perception of its lawlessness and all of its at-
21 tendant contagions. The Executive may succeed for
22 a time in weakening the courts, but over time his-
23 tory will script the tragic gap between what was and
24 all that might have been, and law in time will sign
25 its epitaph.”

1 On April 29, 2025, in an interview with ABC News,
2 while discussing the continued detention of Kilmar
3 Armando Abrego Garcia in El Salvador, the interviewer
4 said, “You could get him back. There’s a phone on this
5 desk.” President Donald John Trump replied, “I could.”

6 Notwithstanding all that has been presented above,
7 the Trump Administration continues to flout the Supreme
8 Court’s April 10, 2025, order, “‘to facilitate’ Abrego Gar-
9 cia’s release from custody in El Salvador and to ensure
10 that his case is handled as it would have been had he not
11 been improperly sent to El Salvador.”

12 On May 2, 2025, Reuters reported that U.S. Su-
13 preme Court Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson addressed
14 President Donald Trump’s attacks on the judiciary. In rel-
15 evant part, the article stated as follows:

16 (1) “U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ketanji
17 Brown Jackson said on Thursday attacks by Repub-
18 lican President Donald Trump and his allies on
19 judges were ‘not random’ and seemed ‘designed to
20 intimidate the judiciary.’”

21 (2) Particularly, U.S. Supreme Court Justice
22 Jackson remarked that, “The attacks are not ran-
23 dom. They seem designed to intimidate those of us
24 who serve in this critical capacity.”

1 (3) Justice Jackson added, “The threats and
2 harassment are attacks on our democracy, on our
3 system of government. And they ultimately risk un-
4 dermining our Constitution and the rule of law.”

5 On May 4, 2025, when asked, President Trump did
6 not affirm his duty to uphold the Constitution, despite his
7 presidential oath to, “faithfully execute the Office of Presi-
8 dent of the United States, and . . . to the best of [his]
9 ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of
10 the United States.” In an NBC News Meet the Press
11 interview, when discussing the facilitation of Abrego Gar-
12 cia’s return, President Trump was asked, “The Constitu-
13 tion says every person, citizens and non-citizens, deserve
14 due process . . . Don’t you need to uphold the Constitu-
15 tion of the United States as President?” to which he re-
16 sponded by saying, “I don’t know.”

17 In all this, President Donald John Trump gravely en-
18 dangered the separation of powers within the government
19 and its institutions. He threatened the integrity of the
20 democratic system by condoning the undermining of the
21 judicial independence of the Federal judiciary, violating
22 the due process clause in the Fifth Amendment of the
23 United States Constitution, denigrating Federal judges,
24 ignoring the separation of powers, condoning the flouting
25 of orders of United States Federal Courts (including or-

1 ders of the United States Supreme Court)—all of which
2 have caused the devolution of democracy within the United
3 States of America into authoritarianism with himself as
4 an authoritarian President. He thereby betrayed his trust
5 as President, to the manifest injury of the people of the
6 United States.

7 Wherefore, authoritarian President Donald John
8 Trump, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will
9 remain a threat to democracy and the Constitution if al-
10 lowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner
11 grossly incompatible with self-governance and the rule of
12 law. Donald John Trump thus warrants impeachment,
13 trial and removal from office, as he is unfit to be Presi-
14 dent.

