



Written by [R. Cort Kirkwood](#) on July 29, 2025

DOJ Files Complaint Against Far-left U.S. District Court Judge Boasberg

The Justice Department has filed a formal complaint against far-left Democratic federal Judge James Boasberg for improper judicial conduct.

Boasberg, chief of the U.S. District Court for Washington, D.C., and appointed by President Barack Obama, has been tangling with the Trump administration over the lawful deportation of illegal aliens. He tried to stop the administration from deporting illegal Venezuelan gang members using the Alien Enemies Act. The U.S. Supreme overruled Boasberg and said the deportations could proceed.



AP Images
James Boasberg

Now, though, he faces a formal complaint about his behavior outside the courtroom. The complaint says Boasberg improperly tried to influence Supreme Court justices and other judges to oppose the administration's initiatives.

Today at my direction, [@TheJusticeDept](#) filed a misconduct complaint against U.S. District Court Chief Judge James Boasberg for making improper public comments about President Trump and his Administration.

These comments have undermined the integrity of the judiciary, and we will...

— Attorney General Pamela Bondi (@AGPamBondi) [July 28, 2025](#)

The Complaint

The five-page complaint to Judge [Sri Srinivasan](#), chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals in D.C., alleges violations of judicial ethics on March 11, just before the court slapped down Boasberg's judicial activism.

At a session of the Judicial Conference of the United States, "which exists to discuss administrative matters like budgets, security, and facilities," the [complaint alleges](#), Boasberg "attempted to improperly influence Chief Justice Roberts and roughly two dozen other federal judges by straying from the traditional topics to express his belief that the Trump Administration would 'disregard rulings of federal courts' and trigger 'a constitutional crisis.'"

"Although his comments would be inappropriate even if they had some basis," the complaint continues, "they were even worse because Judge Boasberg had no basis — the Trump Administration has always complied with all court orders. Nor did Judge Boasberg identify any purported violations of court orders to justify his unprecedented predictions."

The complaint also alleges that Boasberg then acted on that "preconceived belief."



Written by [R. Cort Kirkwood](#) on July 29, 2025

“First, although he lacked authority to do so, he issued a temporary restraining order preventing the Government from removing violent Tren de Aragua terrorists, which the Supreme Court summarily vacated,” the [complaint continues](#):

Throughout the proceedings, Judge Boasberg rushed the government through complex litigation, sometimes giving the Trump Administration less than 48 hours to respond and threatening criminal-contempt proceedings and the appointment of an outside prosecutor against senior Trump Administration officials for failing to comply with an order that had already been vacated.

Taken together, Judge Boasberg’s words and deeds violate Canons of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.

Boasberg trespassed three judicial canons, the complaint alleges. He did not “uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary,” did not “act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary,” and commented publicly “on the merits of a matter pending or impending in any court.”

By targeting a president who is party “to dozens of active cases, the far-left jurist “attempted to transform a routine housekeeping agenda into a forum to persuade the Chief Justice and other federal judges of his preconceived belief that the Trump Administration would violate court orders.”

Breach of Duties

Boasberg “breached his duties” and “defied reality and the law,” the [complaint alleges](#):

First, the Trump Administration has complied with every court order — including the unlawful orders that appellate courts have subsequently stayed or reversed. Second, federal courts must begin from a “presumption of regularity” — the settled doctrine that executive officials “have properly discharged their official duties” absent clear evidence otherwise. By predicting noncompliance, Judge Boasberg turned that presumption on its head, contradicting both the evidence of past compliance and the governing law.

And indeed, Boasberg wasn’t just speaking to a gaggle of disinterested if hate-Trump lawyers. He directed his remarks to Roberts and about “two dozen other federal judges from across the country in an apparent attempt to persuade them to adopt his erroneous view that the Trump Administration would not comply with court orders.”

Those judges, the complaint observes, will hear cases involving the president and the administration. And with Roberts, Boasberg tried to influence the court that would rule on his decision.

The [complaint cites](#) John Yoo, a law professor at the University of California, who said that Boasberg tried “to entrap” Roberts and get him on the record and join him to almost approve what he’s doing to spark this fight with President Trump.”

Amazingly, though SCOTUS put Boasberg in his place in overturning his unlawful move to stop the deportations of illegal-alien gang members, he then “threatened criminal contempt and the appointment of an outside prosecutor.” The Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., “has also recognized Judge Boasberg’s errors, staying his decisions twice.”



Written by [R. Cort Kirkwood](#) on July 29, 2025

[The Federalist broke](#) the story about Boasberg's improper comments.

The U.S. House of Representatives [has moved](#) to impeach him.

TdA Case, Immigrant Judges, Another Complaint

Other cases have spun off from the SCOTUS ruling against Boasberg, who ruled against Trump after five illegals sued in [J.G.G v. Trump](#).

[The high court vacated](#) Boasberg's order, which would have kept Tren de Aragua terror gang members in the country, for two reasons. One, the five illegals did not use a *habeas* petition that alleged unlawful detention. Two, they filed the case in the wrong court.

"Initially, the detainees sought relief in habeas among other causes of action, but they dismissed their habeas claims," the majority wrote. But their challenge to the administration using the enemies statute, "which largely precludes judicial review ... must be brought in habeas."

As well, "for 'core habeas petitions,' 'jurisdiction lies in only one district: the district of confinement,'" the court ruled, citing [Rumsfeld v. Padilla](#), a case involving an al Qaeda terrorist who is a U.S. citizen:

The detainees are confined in Texas, so venue is improper in the District of Columbia. As a result, the Government is likely to succeed on the merits of this action.

The government must also give detained terrorists and criminals "reasonable time" to file a habeas petition, the high court ruled.

One concern for the administration should be the judge to whom DOJ sent the complaint. Padmanabhan Srikanth "Sri" Srinivasan [is an Indian immigrant](#). He might side with Boasberg for obvious reasons.

A Third Of All DC District Judges Were Not Born In United States<https://t.co/lkbT6wZaXY>

— The Federalist (@FDRLST) [March 25, 2025](#)

Immigrant federal judges are more than a growing problem in the courts. As [The New American reported](#) in April, citing *The Federalist*, five of the 15 judges in the D.C. district are immigrants. Presidents Biden and Obama appointed all of them.

[Courthouse News noted](#) that the complaint against Boasberg isn't the administration's first against a D.C. district judge. It also filed a complaint against [Judge Ana Reyes](#).

Reyes is a Uruguayan immigrant.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.