The IRS Leak Settlement: A Corrective for Administrative Malfeasance, not a Constitutional Crisis

Roger A. McEowen
May 18, 2025

Overview

The settlement of President Trump's $10 billion lawsuit against the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the Department of the Treasury has predictably ignited a firestorm of hyperbole. Detractors have rushed to label the newly established $1.776 billion "Anti-Weaponization Fund" a "political slush fund," framing the resolution of this litigation as a subversion of the rule of law.

However, when stripped of partisan rhetoric, this case and its ultimate settlement represent a vital, albeit extraordinary, enforcement of statutory privacy protections against a rogue bureaucracy. It establishes a necessary mechanism to remedy a pervasive and documented problem: the weaponization of the administrative state.

The Statutory Bedrock of Taxpayer Privacy

To understand the legitimacy of the plaintiffs' claims, one must look past the names "Trump" or "Trump Organization" and examine the statutory framework governing tax disclosure. Under federal law, specifically I.R.C. §6103, tax returns and return information are strictly confidential. This is not a polite administrative suggestion; it is a rigid statutory mandate. Congress enacted these stringent protections precisely because the power to tax involves the power to destroy,[1] and the misuse of private financial data for political warfare strikes at the very heart of citizens' trust in their government.

The plaintiffs' complaint,[2] filed in a Miami federal court, rested on a clear failure of agency oversight. The IRS has an unambiguous, affirmative duty to safeguard confidential tax returns and to rigorously screen those to whom it grants access. In this instance, the agency failed catastrophically. Charles Littlejohn, a government contractor working for Booz Allen Hamilton, weaponized his access to systematically steal and leak the private tax records of Donald Trump, his family, his businesses, and thousands of other wealthy Americans to partisan media outlets.

Littlejohn's actions were not a bureaucratic oversight; they were a deliberate, politically motivated assault on privacy. While Littlejohn was rightfully sentenced to five years in prison, his criminal conviction did not absolve the underlying agency of its civil liabilities. By failing to implement required precautions and security protocols, the IRS and the Treasury Department directly caused

[1] The phrase is most famously associated with U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from 1801 to 1835, in McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat) 316 (1819). The statement arose in the context of Maryland's attempt to tax the Second Bank of the United States. Marshall used the phrase to explain why states could not tax federal instrumentalities in a manner that would interfere with federal constitutional powers.
[2] Trump *et al*. v. Internal Revenue Service, *et al.,* No. 1:26-cv-20609 (S.D. Fla. filed Jan. 29, 2026).

the plaintiffs to suffer documented reputational harm, financial disruption, and public embarrassment.

Navigating the Justiciability Hurdle

Critics of the lawsuit initially pointed to a unique constitutional conundrum: can a sitting President sue an executive agency that he technically oversees? U.S. District Judge Kathleen Williams raised legitimate questions regarding justiciability, asking whether the parties possessed the requisite "adversarity" required under Article III of the Constitution, given that the defendants ultimately report to the Chief Executive. However, this argument conflates the President's *official* capacity with his *personal* capacity. The injury suffered - the unlawful exposure of private financial records - was sustained by Donald J. Trump as a private citizen and a business owner, alongside his sons Donald Jr. and Eric, and the Trump Organization.

In addition, the settlement of this case by Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche provides a clean, legally sound resolution to this procedural knot. Voluntary dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41 allows the parties to resolve a dispute without forcing a constitutional showdown over Article III standing limits.

Structuring a Remedy: The Anti-Weaponization Fund

The centerpiece of the settlement - and the target of the loudest political outcry - is the creation of the $1.776 billion Anti-Weaponization Fund, alongside a formal public apology from the IRS. The plaintiffs themselves are notably receiving zero dollars in direct personal monetary damages. Instead, the settlement leverages the Treasury Department's Judgment Fund[3] to establish a systemic process for redressing the grievances of *other* Americans who have faced politically motivated targeting by federal agencies. Far from unprecedented, this model mirrors historical class-action and administrative remedy frameworks (such as the landmark *Keepseagle v. Vilsack*[4] settlement) designed to resolve systemic institutional discrimination.

The creation of this fund is a structural triumph. For quite some time, some lawmakers and legal scholars have warned against the insulation of the "Deep State" and the asymmetric power of

[3] This is a permanent, indefinite appropriation established by Congress to pay certain monetary judgments and settlements entered against the United States. It is codified at 31 U.S.C. §1304 and is administered by the Bureau of the Fiscal Service within the United States Department of the Treasury. The fund serves as a centralized payment mechanism when a court enters a money judgment against the federal government; the government settles litigation; or an administrative award is authorized by statute, and no other specific congressional appropriation is available to pay the obligation. The Judgment Fund is designed to ensure that successful claimants can be paid promptly without requiring Congress to enact a separate appropriation for each case. Payments commonly arise in contract disputes, takings claims, civil rights litigation, employment cases, discrimination claims, and certain class action settlements.

[4] 815 F. Supp. 2d 197 (D.D.C. 2011). The litigation involved Native American farmers and ranchers who brought a class action against the USDA alleging longstanding discrimination in the administration of federal farm loan and benefit programs. The plaintiffs claimed that USDA officials systematically denied or delayed loans, provided less favorable loan terms, and failed to investigate discrimination complaints, causing significant economic harm to Native American agricultural producers. The litigation resulted in a class wide settlement approved by the district court in 2011 providing monetary relief and debt forgiveness to eligible claimants. Post settlement opinions can be found at *Keepseagle v. Vilsack*, 102 F. Supp. 3d 306 (D.D.C. 2015) and *Keepseagle v. Vilsack*, 118 F. Supp. 3d 98 (D.D.C. 2015).

federal agencies to execute "lawfare" against political dissidents.[5] By establishing a five-person commission to review claims, issue apologies, and grant monetary relief to victims of institutional overreach, the Justice Department is introducing an element of long-overdue accountability to Washington.

Conclusion

The administrative state functions on the presumption of neutrality. When an agency as potent as the IRS proves incapable of securing the most sensitive data of American citizens (or worse, allows that data to be deployed as a political cudgel), the courts and the executive branch must intervene to correct the course.

The resolution of the Florida lawsuit is not an abuse of executive power; it is an acknowledgment of administrative failure. By trading personal financial damages for an institutional framework that protects all citizens from bureaucratic weaponization, this settlement reinforces the principle that no federal agency is above the law, and every American has a right to be secure against the overreach of their own government.

[5] *See, e.g.,* Philip Hamburger, *Is Administrative Law Unlawful?* 3–6, 371–73 (2014) (arguing that modern administrative agencies exercise coercive power outside traditional constitutional constraints and can threaten individual liberty and private enterprise); Richard A. Epstein, *The Dangerous Experiment of Administrative Law*, 36 J. Legal Stud. 619, 620–25 (2007) (warning that expansive administrative discretion creates opportunities for selective enforcement and political abuse); George J. Stigler, *The Theory of Economic Regulation*, 2 Bell J. Econ. & Mgmt. Sci. 3, 3–6 (1971)(explaining how regulatory agencies can be captured and used to advance political or private interests at the expense of others); Friedrich A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* 72–87 (1944) (discussing dangers posed when broad discretionary governmental power is exercised without neutral legal constraints).