

119TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. RES. 1309

Impeaching John Glover Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the United States
for high crimes and misdemeanors.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 21, 2026

Mr. COHEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the
Committee on the Judiciary

RESOLUTION

Impeaching John Glover Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the
United States for high crimes and misdemeanors.

1 *Resolved*, That John Glover Roberts, Jr., Chief Jus-
2 tice of the United States, is impeached for high crimes
3 and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of im-
4 peachment be exhibited to the Senate:

5 Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of
6 Representatives of the United States of America in the
7 name of itself and of the people of the United States of
8 America, against John Glover Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice
9 of the United States, in maintenance and support of its
10 impeachment against him for high crimes and mis-

1 demeanors in violation of his constitutional oath of office
2 to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the
3 United States.

4 ARTICLE I: FAILURE OF STEWARDSHIP: POLITIZATION OF
5 THE COURT

6

7 The Chief Justice administers the Court and is a
8 steward of judicial independence. Chief Justice Roberts
9 has failed to uphold the principles of impartiality and
10 independence by allowing the Court to become a political
11 instrument, selectively invoking the Purcell principle and
12 repeatedly inserting the Court into the electoral process
13 in a manner that has consistently favored one political
14 party.

15 Most recently, in *Louisiana v. Callais*, the Court re-
16 leased its decision in the middle of primary elections al-
17 ready underway, prompting states across the country to
18 rush mid-decade redistricting. In Louisiana itself, more
19 than 100,000 voters had already cast ballots when the
20 Court ruled the existing districts unlawful.

21 This is the context of a national cascade of mid-dec-
22 ade partisan redistricting, instigated by President Donald
23 Trump and his pressure on Republican-led state legisla-
24 tures. The Court is well aware of these circumstances,
25 with multiple cases reaching its emergency docket. In the
26 eight days following *Callais*, Tennessee dismantled its only

1 majority-Black congressional district, splitting Memphis
2 into three pieces. Alabama and South Carolina indicated
3 they would follow suit. The Virginia Supreme Court struck
4 down a voter-approved Democratic redistricting amend-
5 ment, a case the Court declined to stay, within days. In
6 contrast, it bypassed its own 32-day waiting period under
7 Supreme Court Rule 45.3 to finalize the decision on an
8 emergency basis, enabling Louisiana to redraw its map in
9 time for the 2026 elections. Similarly, on an expedited
10 basis, the Supreme Court vacated lower court injunctions
11 preventing Alabama from redistricting and allowed a new
12 map to take effect eight days before the primary election.
13 The asymmetrical application of the Purcell principle in
14 a way that benefits Republicans demonstrates the Chief
15 Justice’s inability to administer the court impartially.

16 In a moment of hyper-partisanship and visible, per-
17 sistent presidential pressure on the Court, the Callais deci-
18 sion and its timing would undoubtedly be perceived as po-
19 litical. This pattern of unpredictable intervention in the
20 electoral process—applying the Purcell principle when it
21 favors one party and abandoning it when it does not—
22 demonstrates the Chief Justice’s inability to administer
23 the Court independently and impartially, in violation of
24 his constitutional and statutory obligations and the Judi-
25 cial Oath.

1 specific viewpoints, declaring it a political question beyond
2 judicial reach. In *Louisiana v. Callais*, he joined a decision
3 dismantling the Voting Rights Act’s protections for major-
4 ity-minority districts, empowering state legislatures to
5 privilege political viewpoint over other factors when draw-
6 ing districts and jurisdictions. Together, these decisions
7 undermined the political rights of citizens and empowered
8 those currently in elected office to use government author-
9 ity to entrench themselves and those with preferred polit-
10 ical perspectives, despite the will of the electorate. Taken
11 to its logical end, such a system allows a minority to main-
12 tain control of the state and federal government even after
13 popular opinion shifts against it.

14 In so doing, Chief Justice Roberts gravely violated
15 his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the
16 United States, to faithfully and impartially discharge and
17 perform the duties of the Chief Justice, and to administer
18 justice without respect to persons.

19 ARTICLE III: VIOLATION OF OATH: EMPOWERING THE
20 RICH OVER THE POOR

21

22 In the Judicial Oath, Chief Justice Roberts swore to
23 “do equal right to the poor and to the rich.” However,
24 his conduct has demonstrated a bias toward wealth. The
25 Roberts Court systematically dismantled campaign finance
26 laws designed to protect the integrity of our electoral proc-

1 ess in *Citizens United v. FEC*, *McCutcheon v. FEC*, and
2 *AFPP v. Bonta*. In joining *Citizens United* and authoring
3 the Court’s opinions in *McCutcheon* and *Bonta*, Chief Jus-
4 tice Roberts entrenched a system that favored and consoli-
5 dated power in the wealthy. These decisions undermine the
6 core premise of our Constitution, that every citizen can
7 equally participate in governance. By privileging can-
8 didates who can raise large sums of money and the rich
9 people and corporations that provide those resources,
10 Chief Justice Roberts undermined the structure of the
11 United States Constitution and the political rights of the
12 people of the United States.

13 ARTICLE IV: VIOLATION OF OATH: UNACCOUNTABLE

14 EXECUTIVE BRANCH

15
16 In taking the Judicial Oath, Chief Justice Roberts
17 swore to “administer justice without respect to persons.”
18 However, in *Trump v. United States*, the Chief Justice
19 ruled that a former President has absolute immunity from
20 criminal prosecution. This ruling privileges a select few
21 from the generally applicable criminal law, placing former
22 Presidents out of the reach of legislative and judicial au-
23 thority. This ruling effectively means a President is ex-
24 empt from criminal bribery charges. It undermines the
25 core structure of the Constitution of checks and balances
26 and the constitutional obligation of equal protection under

1 the law. In such conduct, Chief Justice Roberts violated
2 his oath by privileging those in power over the laws of
3 the land.

4 ARTICLE V: VIOLATION OF OATH: ARBITRARY DECISIONS

5

6 Under Chief Justice Roberts’s administration of the
7 Supreme Court, the Court has greatly expanded its use
8 of the emergency docket. These orders, styled as tem-
9 porary interventions but in effect often providing a conclu-
10 sive disposition of the matters, lack any meaningful anal-
11 ysis of the issues, explanation of the decision, or guidance
12 for future application. The precedential value of these or-
13 ders is unclear, and lower courts have struggled to apply
14 them. Rulings without explanation, especially those deter-
15 mined on an incomplete record, are inherently arbitrary.
16 These orders violate the parties’ due process and equal
17 protection rights. As the leader and administrator of the
18 Court, Chief Justice Roberts has an obligation to ensure
19 that the Supreme Court operates in accordance with the
20 Constitution and laws of the United States.

21 ARTICLE VI: VIOLATION OF OATH AND LAWS OF THE

22 UNITED STATES: FAILURE TO RECUSE

23

24 The Constitution provides that the House of Rep-
25 resentatives “shall have the sole Power of Impeachment”
26 and that all civil officers of the United States “shall be

1 removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction
2 of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Mis-
3 demeanors”. Section 455 of title 28, United States Code,
4 provides that “[a]ny justice, judge, or magistrate judge
5 of the United States shall disqualify himself in any pro-
6 ceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be
7 questioned”.

8 During his service on the Supreme Court, Chief Jus-
9 tice Roberts’s spouse, Jane Sullivan Roberts, worked as
10 a legal recruiter, placing candidates in law firms for a fee.
11 In many instances, the legal recruiter’s fee is paid by the
12 law firm and may exceed \$100,000 per placement. Be-
13 tween 2007 and 2014, Jane Sullivan Roberts reportedly
14 earned over \$10 million in commissions through her re-
15 cruitment work. Many of the firms that paid Jane Sullivan
16 Roberts had matters before the Supreme Court.

17 Such an arrangement, in which law firms with mat-
18 ters before the Court pay the Chief Justice’s household
19 expenses, reasonably raises questions about the Chief Jus-
20 tice’s relationship with specific attorneys and the prospect
21 of bias. The Chief Justice’s failure to recuse—and to dis-
22 close Jane Sullivan Roberts’s assets related to her recruit-
23 ment practice in his required financial disclosures—vio-
24 lates judicial standards and the law, and compromises the

1 institutional integrity of the high court, in violation of 28
2 U.S.C. § 455 and the Chief Justice's oath.

3 In all of this, Chief Justice Roberts has acted in a
4 manner contrary to his trust as the Chief Justice of the
5 Supreme Court of the United States, to the great preju-
6 dice of the cause of law and justice, to the manifest injury
7 of the people of the United States.

8 Wherefore, Chief Justice Roberts, by such conduct,
9 warrants impeachment and trial and removal from office,
10 and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor,
11 trust, or profit under the United States.

○