Senator Dick Durbin
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee
Written Questions for Anna St. John
Nominee to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana
February 11, 2026

1. At your hearing, Senator Hirono noted you were a fellow at the Independent Women's Forum (IWF) and asked you about your views on the Supreme Court's decisions in *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965) and *Eisenstadt v. Baird* (1972). IWF was a member of the Project 2025 Advisory Board and has opposed access to contraception.

a. Do you believe there is a constitutional right to privacy?

Response: The Supreme Court has recognized a constitutional right to privacy in certain contexts, including with respect to the use of contraceptives. *See Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965). If confirmed, I would be bound to follow this and all other Supreme Court precedent.

b. Do you believe the right to privacy includes the right to use contraceptives?

Response: Please see my response above.

c. Do you consider the Supreme Court's decisions in *Griswold* and *Eisenstadt* to be settled law?

Response: *Griswold* and *Eisenstadt* are binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply these precedents if confirmed.

2. Publicly available lobbying reports indicate that in 2008 you acted as a lobbyist on foreign investment issues as part of your employment with Covington & Burling. According to the lobbying reports, your client was Temasek Holdings, a Singaporean state-owned investment firm.

What lobbying activities did you engage in on behalf of Temasek Holdings?

Response: As a junior associate, I assisted my colleagues with outreach to federal officials by Temasek Holdings regarding potential investments in the United States.

3. You have repeatedly chosen to litigate politically charged issues, including filing amicus briefs in support of state laws prohibiting transgender girls and women from participating in girls' and women's sports.

a. Why should we have any expectation that you will not act in a partisan fashion if you are confirmed to the federal bench?

Response: In the cases referenced, *Little v. Hecox*/*West Virginia v. B.P.J.*, I filed amicus briefs as an advocate on behalf of high school athletes and athletic coaches and officials of female athletes who wanted the opportunity to present their unique and personal perspective to the court. In contrast to the role of an advocate, the role of a judge requires one to hear argument from multiple perspectives and make a decision based upon the governing law without regard to the identity of the parties or one's personal policy views. If confirmed, I would no longer be acting as an advocate but instead would be called upon to apply legal standards faithfully and impartially. I understand the distinct roles of an advocate, from my own experience representing clients and advancing legal positions with which I may not personally agree, and the role of a judge. If I am confirmed, I will carefully and respectfully consider the arguments of the parties and I will remain committed to deciding cases without prejudgment.

b. Considering your record, why should any transgender person have confidence that you will treat them fairly if you are confirmed to serve as a federal judge?

Response: If confirmed, I would treat all parties, attorneys, and others who appear before me with courtesy, respect, and fairness. I believe that judges have a solemn duty to apply the law and decide cases fairly and impartially without regard to their personal policy views or preferences. Please also see my response above.

4. On January 6, 2021, NBC White House correspondent Kelly O'Donnell shared Vice President Pence's letter to members of Congress.[1] It stated that he would preside over the electoral count and that he did not believe he could "accept or reject electoral votes unilaterally." You retweeted Ms. O'Donnell's post sharing the Vice President's letter.

a. Do you agree with Vice President Pence that he was unable to unilaterally accept or reject electoral votes?

Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any subject of political controversy or the Vice President's proper exercise of his constitutional powers.

b. Do you believe that Vice President Pence could have accepted the votes of fake slates of electors, as part of President Trump's efforts to overturn the results of the 2020 election?

Response: Please see my response above.

c. Do you think Vice President Pence did the right thing by certifying the results of the 2020 election?

[1] Kelly O'Donnell (@KellyO), X (Jan. 6, 2021, 12:56 PM), https://x.com/KellyO/status/1346878303714607110.

Response: Please see my response above.

5. Your financial statement lists your investments in numerous companies, including Palantir, Tesla, Coinbase, and Nvidia.

   If you are confirmed to serve as a district court judge, will you recuse yourself from cases involving companies in which you have a financial interest?

   Response: If confirmed, I will make recusal decisions in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 455, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and any other applicable laws, rules, ethics opinions, and practices governing conflicts of interest.

6. **Did President Trump lose the 2020 election?**

   Response: President Biden was certified the winner of the 2020 election and served as president for four years.

7. **Where were you on January 6, 2021?**

   Response: I was in New Orleans, Louisiana.

8. **Do you denounce the January 6 insurrection?**

   Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any subject of political controversy.

9. **Do you believe that January 6 rioters who were convicted of violent assaults on police officers should have been given full and unconditional pardons?**

   Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any subject of political controversy or the President's proper exercise of his constitutional powers.

10. The Justice Department is currently defending the Trump Administration in a number of lawsuits challenging executive actions taken by the Administration. Federal judges—both Republican and Democratic appointees—have enjoined some of these actions, holding that they are illegal or unconstitutional. Alarmingly, President Trump, his allies, and even some nominees before the Senate Judiciary Committee have responded by questioning whether the executive branch must follow court orders.

    a. **What options do litigants—including the executive branch—have if they disagree with a court order?**

Response: Litigants may request reconsideration, a stay, or deferral of an order consistent with the proper procedures for such a request, or they may appeal.

b. Do you believe a litigant can ever lawfully defy an order from a lower federal court? If yes, in what circumstances?

Response: All parties properly before a federal court are subject to court orders and must comply with those orders. There are certain well-established exceptions to this general principle, such as when a court lacked jurisdiction or if compliance is impossible. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Mine Workers*, 330 U.S. 258, 291 (1947).

c. Under the separation of powers, which branch of the federal government is responsible for determining whether a federal court order is lawful?

Response: Article III of the Constitution provides that "[t]he judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Article III further provides that this power "shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under the Constitution…." In *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 177 (1803), the Supreme Court interpreted this power as establishing that "[i]t is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is."

11. District judges have occasionally issued non-party injunctions, which may include "nationwide injunctions" and "universal injunctions."

a. Are non-party injunctions constitutional?

Response: In *Trump v. CASA, Inc.*, 606 U.S. 831 (2025), the Supreme Court held that "universal injunctions … likely exceed the equitable authority that Congress has granted to federal court." The Supreme Court declined to address the constitutionality of non-party injunctions. Thus, the precise scope of any Article III limitations on non-party or "universal" injunctions remains the subject of ongoing litigation before multiple federal courts.

b. Are non-party injunctions a legitimate exercise of judicial power?

Response: Please see my response above.

c. Is it ever appropriate for a district judge to issue a non-party injunction? If so, under what circumstances is it appropriate?

Response: Please see my response above.

d. As a litigator, have you ever sought a non-party injunction as a form of relief? If so, please list each matter in which you have sought such relief.

Response: I do not recall seeking such an injunction in any case that was not brought under the Administrative Procedure Act. Section 706 of the APA states that a reviewing court "shall … hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be," arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, or otherwise unconstitutional or in excess of statutory authority. Before the Supreme Court ruled in *Trump v. CASA*, I have represented parties in cases brought under the APA in which they sought an order vacating and setting aside action by an administrative agency. I understand the application of *Trump v. CASA*'s holding to the APA is a matter of ongoing litigation.

12. At any point during your selection process, did you have any discussions with anyone—including individuals at the White House, the Justice Department, or any outside groups—about loyalty to President Trump? If so, please provide details.

Response: No.

13. Does the U.S. Constitution permit a president to serve three terms?

Response: The Twenty-Second Amendment states that "no person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice."

14. On May 26, 2025, in a Truth Social post, President Trump referred to some judges whose decisions he disagrees with, as "USA HATING JUDGES" and "MONSTERS", who "…SUFFER FROM AN IDEOLOGY THAT IS SICK, AND VERY DANGEROUS FOR OUR COUNTRY…"[2]

a. Do you agree that these federal judges are "USA HATING" and "MONSTERS" "…SUFFER FROM AN IDEOLOGY THAT IS SICK, AND VERY DANGEROUS FOR OUR COUNTRY…"?

Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on the President's political views and commentary.

b. Do you believe this rhetoric endangers the lives of judges and their families?

Response: Please see my response above.

[2] Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump), TRUTH SOCIAL (May 26, 2025, 7:22 AM), https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/114573871728757682.

15. In addition to the President's own attacks on judges, his adviser Stephen Miller took to social media to call a federal trade court's ruling against President Trump's tariffs a "judicial coup"[3] and later reposted the images of the three judges who decided the case and wrote, "we are living under a judicial tyranny."[4]

a. Do you agree that these judges are engaged in a "judicial coup" and that "we are living under a judicial tyranny"?

Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any subject of political commentary by any of the President's advisers.

b. Do you believe this rhetoric endangers the lives of judges and their families?

Response: Please see my response above.

c. Would you feel comfortable with any politician or their adviser sharing a picture of you on social media if you issue a decision they disagree with?

Response: Please see my response above.

16. When, if ever, may a lower court depart from Supreme Court precedent?

Response: Lower courts are bound to follow all Supreme Court precedent.

17. When, in your opinion, would it be appropriate for a circuit court to overturn its own precedent?

Response: Circuits have adopted standards for overturning their own precedent. As a district court nominee, it would not be appropriate for me to comment on my personal views regarding the appropriate circumstances under which a circuit court may overturn its own precedent. I acknowledge circuits have such authority, and I would faithfully follow Fifth Circuit precedent if confirmed.

18. When, in your opinion, would it be appropriate for the Supreme Court to overrule its own precedent?

[3] Stephen Miller (@StephenM), X, (May 28, 2025, 7:48 PM), https://x.com/StephenM/status/1927874604531409314.
[4] Stephen Miller (@StephenM), X, (May 29, 2025, 8:25 AM), https://x.com/StephenM/status/1928065122657845516.

Response: The U.S. Supreme Court has overruled its own precedent on occasion and has articulated its reasoning for doing so in these cases. *See, e.g.*, *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.*, 597 U.S. 215 (2022); *Brown v. Bd. of Educ.*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). I acknowledge the Supreme Court has authority to overrule its own precedent, and, if confirmed, I would be bound to follow the Supreme Court's precedent.

19. Please answer yes or no as to whether the following cases were correctly decided by the Supreme Court:

a. ***Brown v. Board of Education***

Response: *Brown* was correctly decided, and I agree with the core holding that "separate but equal is inherently unequal." While it is ordinarily improper for judicial nominees to opine on whether or not the Supreme Court correctly decided a case under the Code of Judicial Conduct, I am comfortable making an exception to this rule for *Brown* and *Loving*, consistent with the approach of many previous nominees.

b. ***Plyler v. Doe***

Response: *Plyler* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

c. ***Loving v. Virginia***

Response: *Loving* was correctly decided, and follows from *Brown*'s rejection of "separate but equal" in holding that "the mere 'equal application' of a statute containing racial classifications" is inconsistent with the Fourteenth Amendment. Please also see my response to 19a.

d. ***Griswold v. Connecticut***

Response: *Griswold* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

e. ***Trump v. United States***

Response: *Trump* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

f. ***Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization***

Response: *Dobbs* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

g. ***New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen***

Response: *Bruen* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

h. ***Obergefell v. Hodges***

Response: *Obergefell* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

i. ***Bostock v. Clayton County***

Response: *Bostock* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

j. ***Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado***

Response: *Masterpiece Cakeshop* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

k. ***303 Creative LLC v. Elenis***

Response: *303 Creative* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

l. ***United States v. Rahimi***

Response: *Rahimi* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

m. ***Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo***

Response: *Loper Bright* is binding Supreme Court precedent, and I would faithfully apply it. Otherwise, please see my response to 19a.

20. With respect to constitutional interpretation, do you believe judges should rely on the "original meaning" of the Constitution?

Response: In a number of contexts, the Supreme Court has applied the public's original understanding of a constitutional provision to determine its meaning. *See, e.g.*, *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008); *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36 (2004). If confirmed, I would rely on methodologies consistent with the methods of interpretation that the Supreme Court and Fifth Circuit apply when they undertake interpretation of constitutional provisions. As a lower court judge, I would be bound to follow all applicable precedent of the Supreme Court and Fifth Circuit regardless of whether it comports with the original meaning of the Constitution.

21. How do you decide when the Constitution's "original meaning" should be controlling?

Response: Please see my response above.

22. Does the "original meaning" of the Constitution support a constitutional right to same-sex marriage?

Response: In *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644 (2015), the Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment requires a state to license marriages between two people of the same sex on the same terms and conditions as marriages between two people of the opposite sex. If confirmed, I would be bound to apply all Supreme Court precedent without regard to whether the original meaning of the Constitution supports the precedent. Accordingly, I would faithfully apply *Obergefell* and other binding Supreme Court precedent.

23. Does the "original meaning" of the Constitution support the constitutional right to marry persons of a different race?

Response: In *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967), the Supreme Court struck down a state law prohibiting two people of different races from marrying. As stated in my response to question 19.c, *Loving* was correctly decided in accordance with the Fourteenth Amendment. As further stated in my response to 22, if confirmed, I would be bound by *Loving* and all other Supreme Court decisions.

24. What is your understanding of the Equal Protection and Due Process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment?

Response: Generally speaking, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits the government from denying any person "equal protection of the laws." The Supreme Court has applied this Clause to limit the government from treating individuals similarly situated differently. The level of scrutiny courts apply to a law challenged under the Equal Protection Clause depends upon the classification at issue. In particular, courts apply strict scrutiny to suspect classifications, including race and national origin, and infringements of fundamental rights. Courts apply intermediate scrutiny to quasi-suspect classifications such as those based on sex. Other classifications must have a rational basis. Meanwhile, the Due Process Clause states, "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." The Supreme Court has interpreted the Due Process Clause as providing "substantive, as well as procedural, protection for 'liberty.'" *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.*, 597 U.S. 215, 237 (2022). To determine when to apply substantive protection, the Supreme Court has looked to enumerated and unenumerated rights that are deeply rooted in history and tradition. *See, e.g.*, *id.* at 216.

25. How do these clauses apply to individuals that the Framers of the amendment likely did not have in mind, such as women? Or LGBTQ+ individuals?

Response: The Supreme Court has applied constitutional provisions to discrimination based on sex, *see, e.g.*, *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515 (1996), and sexual orientation, *see, e.g.*, *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620 (1996). If confirmed, I would faithfully apply these decisions and all applicable precedents of the Supreme Court.

26. Do you believe that judges should be "originalist" and adhere to the original public meaning of constitutional provisions when applying those provisions today?

Response: Please see my response to question 20.

27. If so, do you believe that courts should adhere to the original public meaning of the Foreign Emoluments Clause when interpreting and applying the Clause today?

Response: Please see my response to question 20.

28. Under the U.S. Constitution, who is entitled to First Amendment protections?

Response: The First Amendment states, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." The Supreme Court has a number of decisions in which speech regulations are evaluated differently depending on the speaker. For example, in *TikTok, Inc. v. Garland*, 145 S. Ct. 57 (2025), the Court noted that "while laws favoring some speakers over others demand strict scrutiny when the legislature's speaker preference reflects a content preference, such scrutiny is unwarranted when the differential treatment is justified by some special characteristic of the particular [speaker] being regulated." *Id.* at 72-73 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). As another example, in *Ginsberg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629 (1968), the Supreme Court applied free-speech protections differently for minors. If confirmed, I would faithfully follow these and all applicable Supreme Court precedents.

29. How would you determine whether a law that regulates speech is "content-based" or "content-neutral"? What are some of the key questions that would inform your analysis?

Response: Under Supreme Court precedent, a "regulation of speech is facially content based under the First Amendment if it 'target[s] speech based on its communicative content'—that is, if it 'applies to particular speech because of the topic discussed or the idea or message expressed.'" *City of Austin, Texas v. Reagan Nat'l Advertising of Austin, LLC*, 596 U.S. 61, 69 (2022) (quoting *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, 576 U.S. 155, 163 (2015)). The law at issue in *City of Austin* was found to be content neutral because it, in contrast, "required[d] an examination of speech only in service of drawing neutral, location-based lines." *Id.* For this analysis, Supreme Court precedent instructs lower courts to analyze whether a speech regulation "draws distinctions based on the message

a speaker conveys," including distinctions based on the "particular subject matter" of speech or its "function or purpose." *Reed*, 576 U.S. at 163.

30. What is the standard for determining whether a statement is protected speech under the true threats doctrine?

Response: With respect to the true threats doctrine, the Supreme Court has held that the First Amendment does not protect "serious expressions conveying that a speaker means to commit an act of unlawful violence." *Counterman v. Colorado*, 600 U.S. 66, 74 (2023) (internal quotation marks omitted; brackets adopted). Instead, "[t]rue treats of violence are … punishable as crimes." *Id.* at 69. In order to enact such punishment, the government "must prove in true-threats cases that the defendant had some understanding of his statements' threatening character." *Id.* at 73. True threats are distinct from "jests, 'hyperbole,' or other statements that when taken in context do not convey a real possibility that violence will follow…." *Id.* at 74.

31. Is every individual within the United States entitled to due process?

Response: The Fifth Amendment provides that "no shall any person … be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law…." The Supreme Court has interpreted the Due Process Clause to "appl[y] to all 'persons' within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is unlawful, temporary, or permanent." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). Questions of due process typically relate to the question of what process is due in a given situation. Consistent with the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on such questions which are a matter of political controversy and pending litigation.

32. Can U.S. citizens be transported to other countries for the purpose of being detained, incarcerated, or otherwise penalized?

Response: Please see my response above.

33. The Fourteenth Amendment states: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

a. Is every person born in the United States a citizen under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Response: I understand that this question is currently at issue in active litigation and is the subject of significant legal and public debate. Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any subject of political controversy or at issue in ongoing litigation that could come before me if confirmed.

b. Is the citizenship or immigration status of the parents of an individual born in the United States relevant for determining whether the individual is a citizen under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Response: Please see my response above.

34. Do you believe that demographic and professional diversity on the federal bench is important? Please explain your views.

Response: Yes, I believe it is important for judges from all demographics to be considered equally for positions in the judicial branch and for no one to be excluded on the basis of any protected characteristic. I believe that judges' exposure to a variety of opinions, experiences, and perspectives fosters a richer intellectual understanding of and ability to consider issues that may come before the court.

35. The bipartisan *First Step Act of 2018*, which was signed into law by President Trump, is one of the most important pieces of criminal justice legislation to be enacted during my time in Congress. At its core, the Act was based on a few key, evidence-based principles. First, incarcerated people can and should have meaningful access to rehabilitative programming and support in order to reduce recidivism and help our communities prosper. Second, overincarceration through the use of draconian mandatory minimum sentences does not serve the purposes of sentencing and ultimately causes greater, unnecessary harm to our communities. With these rehabilitative principles in mind, one thing Congress sought to achieve through this Act was giving greater discretion to judges—both before and after sentencing—to ensure that the criminal justice system effectively and efficiently fosters public safety for the benefit of all Americans.

a. How do you view the role of federal judges in implementing the *First Step Act*?

Response: As with all law, judges should faithfully apply the Act in cases where it is applicable, consistent with the text of the law and applicable precedent.

b. Will you commit to fully and fairly considering the individualized circumstances of each defendant who comes before you when imposing sentences to ensure that they are properly tailored to promote the goals of sentencing and avoid terms of imprisonment in excess of what is necessary?

Response: I will faithfully apply all applicable laws governing sentencing determinations, including 18 U.S.C. § 3553.

36. The Federalist Society seeks to "reorder[] priorities within the legal system to place a premium on individual liberty, traditional values, and the rule of law."

a. In your Questionnaire, you state that you are currently a member of the Federalist Society. What is your understanding of "traditional values"?

Response: I am unfamiliar with this statement, did not write it, and therefore decline to opine on what the Federalist Society might have intended with its use of that term.

b. President Trump wrote on Truth Social that the Federalist Society gave him "bad advice" on "numerous Judicial Nominations." He also wrote that Leonard Leo is a "sleazebag" who "probably hates America." If you are not familiar with this post, please refer to it in the footnote.[5]

i. Do you agree with President Trump that the Federalist Society provided President Trump with bad advice during his first term? Why or why not?

Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on the President's commentary or the statements of any political figure or on any subject of political controversy.

ii. Do you agree with President Trump that Leo is a sleazebag who probably hates America? Why or why not?

Response: Please see my response above.

iii. If you are confirmed, do you plan to remain affiliated with the Federalist Society?

Response: I have stepped back from my position on the Free Speech Executive Committee. I have not made plans one way or the other as to whether to remain a member if confirmed.

c. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with the Federalist Society, including Leonard Leo or Steven G. Calabresi? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: During my selection process, I served on the Federalist Society's Free Speech Executive Committee, and I have numerous friends and professional acquaintances who are among the thousands of individuals associated with the Federalist Society. Certain of these friends and professional acquaintances were involved in my background check, and, as a result, I kept them generally apprised of significant developments in my selection process. I have not spoken with Mr. Leo or Mr. Calabresi.

[5] Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump), TRUTH SOCIAL (May 29, 2025, 8:10 PM), https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/114593880455063168.

d. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to the Federalist Society, including research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: On occasion, I have been invited by student chapters of the Federalist Society to speak at their events or invited by the Federalist Society to moderate a panel or discuss a legal topic. All such engagements are listed in my as-amended Senate Judiciary Questionnaire.

e. Have you ever been paid honoraria by the Federalist Society? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: I have been paid honoraria for certain speaking events, including those at student chapters. The amount has changed over time but has never exceeded $1500 per event.

37. The Teneo Network states that its purpose is to "Recruit, Connect, and Deploy talented conservatives who lead opinion and shape the industries that shape society."

a. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with the Teneo Network, including Leonard Leo? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: No, not to my knowledge.

b. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to the Teneo Network, including research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: No.

c. Have you ever been paid honoraria by the Teneo Network? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: No.

38. The Heritage Foundation states that its mission is to "formulate and promote public policies based on the principles of free enterprise, limited government, individual freedom, traditional American values, and a strong national defense." Heritage Action, which is affiliated with the Heritage Foundation, seeks to "fight for conservative policies in Washington, D.C. and in state capitals across the country."

a. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with the Heritage Foundation or Heritage Action, including Kevin D. Roberts? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: On previous occasions, I attended the Heritage Foundation's monthly Public Interest Law Group meetings. I generally stopped attending these meetings during the selection process.

b. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to the Heritage Foundation or Heritage Action, including research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: I briefly spoke at one of the Heritage Foundation's Public Interest Law Group meetings about a case I was working on. Otherwise, no.

c. Were you ever involved in or asked to contribute to Project 2025 in any way?

Response: No.

d. Have you ever been paid honoraria by the Heritage Foundation or Heritage Action? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: No.

39. The America First Policy Institute (AFPI) states that its "guiding principles are liberty, free enterprise, national greatness, American military superiority, foreign-policy engagement in the American interest, and the primacy of American workers, families, and communities in all we do."

a. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with AFPI? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: During my selection process, I served as co-counsel with attorneys with America First Policy Institute to represent high school athletes filing an amicus brief in *Little v. Hecox/West Virginia v. B.P.J.* We did not discuss my potential nomination.

b. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to AFPI, including research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: Please see my response above.

c. Have you ever been paid honoraria by AFPI? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: No.

40. The America First Legal Institute (AFLI) states that it seeks to "oppose the radical left's anti-jobs, anti-freedom, anti-faith, anti-borders, anti-police, and anti-American crusade."

a. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with AFLI, including Stephen Miller, Gene Hamilton, or Daniel Epstein? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: No.

b. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to AFLI, including but not limited to research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: No.

c. Have you ever been paid honoraria by AFLI? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: No.

41. The Article III Project is an organization which claims that, "The left is weaponizing the power of the judiciary against ordinary citizens."

a. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with the Article III Project, including Mike Davis, Will Chamberlain, or Josh Hammer? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: No.

b. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to the Article III Project, including research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: No.

c. Have you ever been paid honoraria by the Article III Project? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: No.

42. The Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) states that it is "the world's largest legal organization committed to protecting religious freedom, free speech, the sanctity of life, marriage and family, and parental rights."

a. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with ADF? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: I am acquainted with a number of individuals associated with ADF and may have exchanged small talk or discussed the general logistics for an amicus brief I filed on behalf of high school athletes in the *Little v. Hecox*/*B.P.J. v. West Virginia* cases in which ADF represented parties while the selection process was underway.

b. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to ADF, including research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: I have represented amici that have filed briefs in cases in which ADF served as counsel.

c. Have you ever been paid honoraria by ADF? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: No.

43. The Concord Fund, also known as the Judicial Crisis Network, states that it is committed "to the Constitution and the Founders' vision of a nation of limited government; dedicated to the rule of law; with a fair and impartial judiciary." It is affiliated with the 85 Fund, also known as the Honest Elections Project and the Judicial Education Project.

a. During your selection process, have you spoken to or corresponded with any individuals associated with these organizations, including Leonard Leo or Carrie Severino? If so, please provide details of those discussions.

Response: No, not to my knowledge.

b. Have you ever been asked to and/or provided services to these organizations, including research, analysis, advice, speeches, or appearing at events?

Response: No.

c. Have you ever been paid honoraria by these organizations? If so, how much were you paid, and for what services?

Response: No.

d. Do you have any concerns about outside groups or special interests making undisclosed donations to front organizations like the Concord Fund or 85 Fund in support of your nomination? Note that I am not asking whether you have solicited any such donations, I am asking whether you would find such donations to be problematic.

Response: I am unaware of any such donations. I am not familiar with the Concord Fund or the 85 Fund. To the extent this question asks for my personal

policy preferences or opinion with respect to such donations, it would not be appropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment, consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees

e. If you learn of any such donations, will you commit to call for the undisclosed donors to make their donations public so that if you are confirmed you can have this information when you make decisions about recusal in cases that these donors may have an interest in?

Response: To the extent this question seeks information regarding my personal policy preferences or opinion with respect to such donations, please see my response above. Impartiality and the appearance of impartiality are critically important to maintaining public confidence in our judicial system. If confirmed, I will address all actual or potential conflicts in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 455, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and any other applicable laws, rules, ethics opinions, and practices governing conflicts of interest.

f. Will you condemn any attempt to make undisclosed donations to the Concord Fund or 85 Fund on behalf of your nomination?

Response: Please see my above responses.

Nomination of Anna St. John
Nominee to be District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana
Questions for the Record
Submitted February 11, 2026

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR WHITEHOUSE

Please answer each question and sub-question individually and as specifically as possible.

1. How many cases have you tried to verdict or final judgment?

   Response: I have tried two cases to verdict or final judgment. As stated in my Senate Judiciary Questionnaire, I was co-counsel in one and associate counsel in the other. In addition to these bench trials, I have actively contributed to two jury trials that went to verdict and three other jury trials that settled in the midst of jury selection or trial proceedings, including both civil and criminal.

   a. Were you sole or primary counsel in any of those cases?

      Response: Please see my response above.

   b. Did any of those cases involve jury trials?

      Response: Please see my response above.

   c. Were any of those cases criminal proceedings?

      Response: Please see my response above.

Senate Judiciary Committee
Hearing on
Nominations
February 4, 2026
Questions for the Record
Senator Amy Klobuchar

For Anna St. John, to be U.S. District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana
In November 2021, you testified in a House Judiciary Committee hearing in opposition to the bipartisan *Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act*, which was voted out of the this committee unanimously and passed into law in 2022.

Gretchen Carlson testified before this committee: "When a sexual assault or harassment case is forced into the rigged process of arbitration, there is no public accountability from the corporation and there is no justice for the victim or survivor."

- Given your prior advocacy, what would you say to survivors of sexual harassment and assault in the workplace who may be concerned about your impartiality on this issue?

  Response: I disagree with the characterization that I engaged in advocacy. In 2021, I was invited to testify before the House Judiciary Committee regarding my knowledge and experience as to out-of-court dispute resolution. I viewed my role as providing information at the request of Members of Congress to enable full consideration of the legislation. I have great respect and gratitude for survivors of sexual harassment and assault who seek to hold the perpetrators accountable, thus helping to prevent them from harming others. In cases involving this issue, as in all cases that come before me, I would apply the law and decide the case impartially regardless of my personal beliefs.

Nomination of Anna St. John to the
United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
Questions for the Record
Submitted February 11, 2026

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR COONS

1. Do you believe that the Senate Judiciary Committee has a responsibility to evaluate judicial nominees to the best of its ability, including by asking questions on the record to make each nominee's unique background and viewpoint clear to the American people?

   Response: Under Article II, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the Senate provides advice and consent to the President's nominees to the federal courts. I believe the Senate Judiciary Committee can fulfill this role by evaluating judicial nominees to the best of its ability.

2. Do you believe that you, as a judicial nominee, have a responsibility to the American people to give full and complete answers to the Committee's questions to the best of your ability and in good faith?

   Response: I believe that, as a judicial nominee, I have a responsibility to provide truthful and complete responses to the Committee's questions within the confines of the Canons of Judicial Conduct and other applicable standards for judicial nominees to the best of my ability and in good faith.

3. Do you believe you fulfilled this responsibility with the answers you have provided to my questions for the record?

   Response: Yes.

   a. Did you receive assistance from staff in the White House, the Department of Justice, or any other organization in writing your responses to these questions? If so, from whom did you receive assistance and what was the nature of the assistance you received?

      Response: The Department of Justice provided general guidelines and referred me to samples of previous nominees' responses. All responses provided are my own.

   b. Do you believe it is appropriate for a nominee to answer my questions for the record with the verbatim answers of previous nominees who answered the same questions?

      Response: I believe nominees should provide responses that they believe to be true and correct. If that standard is met, I do not believe it is inappropriate for one to provide the same answer as a previous nominee to an identical or similar question.

c. Did you review the answers to my questions for the record submitted by previous judicial nominees before answering these questions?

Response: I reviewed a number of responses by judicial nominees to questions for the record generally to better understand the process.

d. To your knowledge, are any of your answers to these questions for the record exact duplicates of answers provided by previous nominees?

Response: Because many of the questions for the record are the same for multiple judicial nominees, I would expect for certain answers, particularly short ones, to be substantially similar if not identical to answers provided by previous nominees.

4. At any point during the process that led to your nomination, did you make any representations or commitments to anyone—including but not limited to individuals at the White House, at the Justice Department, or at outside groups—as to how you would handle a particular case or matter if confirmed? If so, explain fully.

Response: No.

a. At any point during the process that led to your nomination, were you asked about your opinion on any cases that involve President Trump or the Trump administration?

Response: No.

5. When it comes to conducting yourself ethically, who in the legal profession do you see as a role model?

Response: The judge for whom I clerked and my late grandfather.

6. How would you describe your judicial philosophy?

Response: My judicial philosophy is that judges should apply the law faithfully and impartially, even when the result does not align with their personal preferences. Judges have a duty to exercise the judicial power and duties of Article III in accordance with the Constitution, their judicial oath of office, the Canons of Conduct for U.S. Judges, and all other applicable laws.

7. With respect to substantive due process, what factors do you look to when a case requires you to determine whether a right is fundamental and protected under the Fourteenth Amendment?

Response: If confirmed, I would faithfully apply Supreme Court precedent when determining whether a right is fundamental and protected under the Fourteenth

Amendment, including *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, 720-21 (1997), and *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 597 U.S. 215, 237-40 (2022).

a. Would you consider whether the right is expressly enumerated in the Constitution?

   Response: Yes.

b. Would you consider whether the right is deeply rooted in this nation's history and tradition? If so, what types of sources would you consult to determine whether a right is deeply rooted in this nation's history and tradition?

   Response: Yes. I would consult the types of sources the Supreme Court identified in *Dobbs*, 597 U.S. at 237-40, and other applicable precedent.

c. Would you consider whether the right has previously been recognized by Supreme Court or circuit precedent? What about the precedent of another court of appeals?

   Response: Yes.

d. Would you consider whether a *similar* right has previously been recognized by Supreme Court or circuit precedent?

   Response: Yes.

e. What other factors would you consider?

   Response: I would consider any other factor that the Supreme Court or Fifth Circuit has identified in precedent as relevant to assessing whether a right is fundamental and protected under the Fourteenth Amendment.

8. If you concluded that the President had violated his constitutional duty to faithfully execute the laws and then had to determine the remedy, what process would you use to perform that analysis? I assume you would faithfully follow binding precedent, but what specific precedents and/or other sources of law would you look to?

   Response: The Take Care Clause in Article II of the Constitution provides, in part, that the President "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." If confirmed, and if presented with a case involving a potential violation of this clause, I would follow binding precedent and consider applicable constitutional provisions. As a judicial nominee, it would be inappropriate for me to opine on how I might decide a hypothetical and abstract case.

9. Is President Trump eligible to be elected President for a third term in 2028? Assume that I know what the text of the 22nd Amendment says. I am interested in your application of that text to whether or not President Trump can be elected President in 2028.

   Response: The Twenty-Second Amendment states that "No person shall be elected to the office of President more than twice." Under the text of this amendment, no one may be elected president for a third term.

10. If Congress certifies a candidate as being the winner of a presidential election, does that mean that the candidate won the election? If not, what does it mean?

    Response: A candidate certified as the winner of a presidential election becomes the President and serves out his term of office.

11. At your Senate Judiciary Committee nomination hearing, Senator Blumenthal asked you who won the popular vote in the 2020 election. You replied that "Joe Biden was certified the winner of the 2020 election and served four years." When he asked you who won the electoral college, you echoed fellow nominee Andrew Davis's answer that "in 2020, President Biden was certified and served four years as president."

    a. In advance of the hearing, did you prepare a potential answer or set of answers to question(s) you might receive related to who won the 2020 election? If so, what information or sources did you use to develop your answer(s)?

       Response: In advance of the hearing, I watched a number of previous nomination hearings and began educating myself as to the Canons of Judicial Conduct. From these past hearings, I was aware that these questions had been asked of numerous judicial nominees, and I agreed with their assessment that commenting beyond the response I provided would be inappropriate for a judicial nominee under the Canons of Judicial Conduct.

    b. Prior to the hearing, did anyone instruct, suggest, imply, or otherwise represent that you should avoid directly answering questions about who won the 2020 election? If so, please explain. If not, please explain how you, without any outside input, made the decision to reply with who was *certified* the winner when asked about who *won* the 2020 election.

       Response: Please see my response above.

    c. Do you believe that you would face any adverse professional consequences if you directly stated, during your hearing or otherwise on the record, that President Trump lost the 2020 election, or that President Biden won the 2020 election? Please explain.

       Response: The Canons of Judicial Conduct set standards to ensure that judges are viewed by the public, and are in fact, impartial with respect to political parties and

controversies and potential cases that come before them. I believe that wading into controversial political matters and matters that are the subject of ongoing litigation could adversely affect my professional reputation for impartiality and compliance with applicable professional standards of conduct.

12. Under 28 U.S.C. § 455, "[a]ny justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify [themself] in any proceeding in which [their] impartiality might reasonably be questioned." As a general matter, what criteria would you use when deciding whether to recuse yourself from a case?

    Response: If confirmed, I will make recusal decisions in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 455, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and any other applicable laws, rules, ethics opinions, and practices governing conflicts of interest.

13. I have been proud to co-lead the bipartisan *Safer Supervision Act*, a bill to reform our federal supervised release system that has received substantial conservative and law enforcement support. The premise of the bill is that our federal supervision system has strayed far from how Congress designed it, as courts impose it mechanically in essentially every case, which means that probation officers do not have time to properly supervise those who most need it. The bill reinforces courts' existing obligations under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553 and 3583 to impose supervision as warranted by the individual facts of the case and encourages more robust use of early termination when warranted to provide positive incentives encouraging rehabilitation. At the encouragement of a bipartisan group of members of Congress, the U.S. Sentencing Commission adopted an amendment to supervision guidelines implementing certain parts of the bill; this amendment went into effect on November 1.

    a. As a sentencing judge, would you endeavor to impose supervision thoughtfully and on the basis of the individual facts of the case consistent with 18 U.S.C. § 3553 and 18 U.S.C. § 3583?

       Response: Yes.

    b. Would you agree that the availability of early termination under 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1) can provide individuals positive incentives to rehabilitate?

       Response: If confirmed, I would carefully consider all relevant factors as applied to the individual facts of the case when making decisions under 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). As a judicial nominee, it would not be appropriate or prudent for me to discuss the potential incentives of this provision in an abstract and hypothetical scenario.

    c. Will you commit if confirmed to reviewing the *Safer Supervision Act* and the recent Sentencing Commission amendment and considering them as you develop your approach to sentencing of supervised release?

Response: Yes.

14. If you had to determine whether it is appropriate for the President of the United States to punish a law firm for taking on a client that the President did not like, what process would you use to perform that analysis? I assume you would faithfully follow binding precedent, but what specific precedents and/or other sources of law would you look to?

    Response: Because this question asks me to weigh in on an issue that is the subject of active litigation, it would be inappropriate for me to respond under the Code of Judicial Conduct.

15. Do you agree that the constitutional right to travel across state lines is fundamental and well established?

    Response: The Supreme Court has long described the right to travel across state lines as a fundamental right. *See, e.g.*, *Crandall v. Nevada*, 73 U.S. 35, 48-49 (1868) ("one people, with one common country … members of the same community must have the right to pass and repass throughout every part without interruption"); *United States v. Guest*, 383 U.S. 745, 757 (1965) (right to interstate travel is "fundamental to the concept of our Federal Union"); *Saenz v. Roe*, 526 U.S. 489 (1999) ("[T]he 'constitutional right to travel from one State to another' is firmly embedded in our jurisprudence." (quoting *Guest*, 383 U.S. at 757). If confirmed, I would be bound to follow this precedent.

    a. If you had to determine whether it is constitutional for a state to restrict the interstate travel of its citizens, what process would you use to perform that analysis? I assume you would faithfully follow binding precedent, but what specific precedents and/or other sources of law would you look to?

       Response: Please see my response above.

16. Do you believe that the Constitution protects a fundamental right to privacy?

    Response: The Supreme Court has recognized a constitutional right to privacy in certain contexts, including privacy with respect to the use of contraceptives. *See Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965). If confirmed, I would be bound to follow this and all other precedent.

17. At your Senate Judiciary Committee nomination hearing, Senator Hirono asked you if you considered *Griswold v. Connecticut* and *Eisenstadt v. Baird* to be settled law. You replied that you "would have to look and see whether they've been overturned" and that "if they're binding law, [you] would apply them."

    a. Since your nomination hearing, have you examined whether *Griswold v. Connecticut* has "been overturned" or remains "binding law"? If so, what was your conclusion?

Response: I understand that *Griswold v. Connecticut* is binding precedent, and I would faithfully apply it.

b. Since your nomination hearing, have you examined whether *Eisenstadt v. Baird* has "been overturned" or remains "binding law"? If so, what was your conclusion?

Response: I understand that *Eisenstadt v. Baird* is binding precedent, and I would faithfully apply it.

18. Do you agree that the fundamental right to privacy protects a woman's right to use contraceptives? If you do not agree, please explain whether this right is protected or not and which constitutional rights or provisions encompass it.

Response: In *Griswold v. Connecticut*, the Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment protects the use of contraceptives. *Griswold* is binding precedent, and, if confirmed, I would faithfully follow it and all other applicable Supreme Court and Fifth Circuit precedents.

19. Does the public's original understanding of the meaning of a constitutional provision constrain its application decades or centuries later?

Response: In a number of contexts, the Supreme Court has applied the public's original understanding of a constitutional provision to determine its meaning. *See, e.g.*, *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36 (2004); *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008). If confirmed, I would be bound to follow all applicable precedent of the Supreme Court regardless of whether it comports with the original meaning of the Constitution.

a. What specific sources would you employ to discern the public's original understanding of the meaning of a constitutional provision? Please provide three examples of sources you consider reliable in this regard.

Response: To discern the public's original understanding, I would consult the text of the constitutional provision, precedent, and historical sources.

20. Do you believe that immigrants, regardless of legal status, are entitled to due process and fair adjudication of their claims?

Response: Judges have a duty to adjudicate all claims that come before them fairly and impartially, regardless of the identity of the party. The Fifth Amendment provides that "no shall any person … be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law…." The Supreme Court has interpreted the Due Process Clause to "appl[y] to all 'persons' within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is unlawful, temporary, or permanent." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). Questions of due process typically relate to the question of what process is due in a given situation. Consistent with the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, it would be

inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on such questions which are a matter of political controversy and pending litigation.

21. Should you be confirmed, what would you do if a party refuses to comply with one of your orders?

    Response: I would consider any party's request for reconsideration, a stay, or deferral of an order if brought consistent with the proper procedures for such a request. I would also consider a party's argument that it has a valid defense or excuse for non-compliance. In appropriate circumstances, where no such requests or arguments are legally appropriate, I would also consider sanctions and contempt.

22. What criteria would you use to determine whether a party was engaging in abusive litigation tactics, such as excessive discovery requests, repeatedly or frivolously filing motions, or other procedural delays?

    Response: I would consider the federal rules, any court-specific rules, any applicable statutes, precedent, and the relevant facts and arguments by the parties.

    a. If you determined that a party was engaging in such tactics, how would you address it?

       Response: I would provide the party with notice and an opportunity to be heard, and then consider the party's arguments and the applicable law. Depending on the circumstances, I would consider issuing sanctions to appropriately address the abuse.

23. What role, if any, should the practical consequences of a particular ruling play in a judge's rendering of a decision?

    Response: Generally, judges should decide cases based upon the applicable law and facts without considering outside factors such as the practical consequences; however, there are exceptions in which the applicable legal test may include consideration of the effects.

24. What role, if any, should a judge's personal life experience play in his or her decision-making process?

    Response: A judge should decide cases impartially, without regard to his or her personal views or circumstances. In certain aspects, however, a judge's personal life experiences will have shaped his or her legal knowledge and commitment to the rule of law, the importance of judicial independence, and other values and characteristics important to the judicial role.

25. What role, if any, should empathy play in a judge's decision-making process?

Response: Judges have a duty to decide cases based upon applicable law, without regard to any personal preference or bias for one party or another. Judges nevertheless may show empathy by treating the parties, attorneys, and others who appear in their courtroom with courtesy and respect, and by explaining their reasoning to show that their decisions are based on a neutral application of the law to the relevant facts.

26. What case or legal matter are you most proud of having worked on during your career?

Response: I am most proud of my work protecting consumers and shareholders from abusive class action procedures. Class action lawsuits aggregate small claims from a large group of injured parties to create enough damages such that litigation can go forward, when otherwise it would not be cost-effective on an individualized basis. These cases are a useful tool to keep bad corporate actors from inflicting lots of small injuries on people without any consequences. In practice, most class actions settle rather than go to trial. The settlement process is ripe for abuse, largely due to the absentee nature of the plaintiffs and the inherent self-interest of the defendants (to get out of the case as cheaply as possible) and the plaintiffs' attorneys (to get paid). My work has redirected funds back to consumers in numerous cases, such as those in which the parties initially sought to give the funds to third-party organizations of their choosing rather than the injured class members and when the attorneys wildly exaggerated their fees so as to recover an unreasonable percentage of the settlement fund.

27. Some district court judges have issued standing orders indicating that the court will favor holding an oral argument when there is a representation that the argument would be handled by a junior lawyer. Such efforts are intended to provide more speaking opportunities in court for junior lawyers. Would you consider issuing a standing order that would encourage more junior lawyers to handle oral arguments? Why or why not?

Response: Yes, I would consider issuing such a standing order. I have benefited greatly in my career from more senior attorneys ensuring that I had opportunities to present argument in court, and the legal profession benefits from the cultivation of the next generation of lawyers. I would also consider, however, that attorneys have a duty to zealously represent their clients' interests and likely are better positioned to make decisions about oral argument. Additionally, judges have a duty to apply the law to the facts to the best of their ability, and this adjudicative duty may be best executed through oral argument that tests each side's position.

a. How else would you support the skills development of junior lawyers appearing before you?

Response: I would be respectful and attentive to junior lawyers' arguments and seek to exude a welcoming demeanor to put them at ease, while applying the high standards demanded of our profession to their appearances.

28. Discuss your proposed hiring process for law clerks.

Response: Out of respect for the Senate's consideration of my nomination, I have not set a process for hiring law clerks. In general, I would expect to consider clerkship applicants based upon their entire applications, recommendations, and supporting materials, as well as their understanding of the role of a law clerk.

a. Do you think law clerks should be protected by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act?

Response: As a judicial nominee, it would be inappropriate for me to opine on policy questions relating to whether Congress should amend Title VII's exemption for the federal judiciary. I can represent, however, that, if confirmed, discrimination would have no place in my chambers.

29. Recently, multiple studies have revealed ongoing problems with workplace conduct policies and outcomes in the federal judiciary. In a national climate survey, hundreds of judiciary employees reported that they experienced sexual harassment, discrimination, or other forms of misconduct on the job. A study by the Federal Judicial Center and the National Academy of Public Administration found the branch has failed to set up trusted reporting systems for employees who experience misconduct or ensure those handling complaints are adequately trained.

a. If confirmed, what proactive steps would you take to ensure that the clerks and judicial assistants who work in your chambers are treated with respect and are not subject to misconduct?

Response: I would lead by example by treating all clerks and judicial assistants with courtesy and respect, just as I was treated as a law clerk.

b. What proactive steps would you take to ensure that any workplace-related concerns that your clerks and judicial assistants may have are fully addressed?

Response: I would have an open-door policy such that clerks and judicial assistants could communicate workplace-related concerns at any time and make clear that everyone in chambers is expected to treat everyone professionally and respectfully.

c. If you are confirmed and you later hear from a colleague or your chambers staff that another judge is acting inappropriately, what steps would you take to help ensure the problem is addressed?

Response: I would determine first whether my court has a process or other guidelines for addressing the problem. Further steps would depend on the specific facts and the guidance available from the court.

30. Do you agree with me that the attack at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, was an insurrection? Why or why not?

Response: As a judicial nominee, in the light of the significant political debate surrounding the events of January 6, 2021, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on whether those events were an insurrection. "Insurrection" is a legal term that appears in statutory law and the U.S. Constitution and whose application to those involved in the referenced events may come before me if I am confirmed, which is another reason it would be inappropriate for me to comment.

a. If you think this question would require you to express an opinion on "political" matters, as some judicial nominees have responded when asked this question, please explain why labeling the events of January 6, 2021, as either "an insurrection" or "not an insurrection" requires you to opine on a "political" matter.

Response: Please see my response to question 30.

31. As you know, the President has the power under the Constitution to grant executive clemency relief. Even so, in your opinion, do you think the individuals convicted of assaulting law enforcement officers at the Capitol on January 6, 2021, deserved to be pardoned? I am asking for your opinion about whether the pardons were prudent, not whether the President has the authority to issue them.

Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any subject of political controversy or the President's proper exercise of his constitutional powers.

32. If you were the President on January 20, 2025, would you have pardoned the individuals convicted of assaulting law enforcement officers at the Capitol on January 6, 2021? Again, I know that the President has the power under the Constitution to grant executive clemency relief. I want to know whether you—if serving as President on January 20, 2025—would have chosen to issue pardons to those convicted of assaulting law enforcement officers at the Capitol on January 6, 2021.

Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any subject of political controversy or my personal views as to the appropriate exercise of the President's constitutional powers.

33. You submitted briefs to the U.S. Supreme Court arguing against the participation of transgender women in women's scholastic sports, referring to them as "males." In an amicus brief for *Little v. Hecox*/*West Virginia v. B.P.J.*, you wrote, "thousands of girls each season face a hostile environment where they are compelled to assent to a fundamental untruth: that males are females. This spectacle is rigorously policed by a few militant idealogues, while the many are cowed into silence."

a. Would you agree that your work on these matters creates at least the appearance of partiality with respect to cases involving the rights of transgender people?

Response: No, I would not. In *Little v. Hecox*/*West Virginia v. B.P.J.*, I filed amicus briefs as an advocate on behalf of high school athletes and athletic coaches and officials of female athletes who wanted the opportunity to present their unique and personal perspective to the court. In contrast to the role of an advocate, the role of a judge requires one to hear argument from multiple perspectives and make a decision based upon the governing law without regard to the identity of the parties or one's personal policy views. If confirmed, I would consider the parties' arguments and impartially make decisions based upon the governing law.

b. What would you say to a transgender litigant who feels they would not receive a fair process from you, given your stated beliefs about transgender identity?

Response: If confirmed, I would treat all parties, attorneys, and others who appear before me with courtesy, respect, and fairness. I believe that judges have a solemn duty to apply the law and decide cases fairly and impartially without regard to their personal policy views or preferences. Please also see my response above.

c. If you are confirmed, will you recuse yourself from cases involving the rights of transgender people?

Response: If confirmed, I will make recusal decisions in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 455, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and any other applicable laws, rules, ethics opinions, and practices governing conflicts of interest.

34. You wrote an article in *The American Spectator* arguing that the U.S. Supreme Court should "reexamine its misguided precedent" in the seminal defamation case *New York Times v. Sullivan*, which you argue created an "onerous test [that] has no basis in the history of the First Amendment." Given your stated views, would you recuse yourself from cases involving the application of this precedent?

Response: If confirmed, I will make recusal decisions in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 455, the Code of Judicial Conduct, and any other applicable laws, rules, ethics opinions, and practices governing conflicts of interest.

35. In your Senate Judiciary Questionnaire, you note that just 10% of your practice has involved criminal proceedings.

a. Why do you think you are qualified to serve as a federal judge overseeing a substantial criminal docket if you have so little experience with criminal cases?

Response: I have handled cases in a vast array of different areas of the law during my 20 years as a practicing attorney. In each case involving a new and different area of the law, I have worked hard, and quickly, to understand the relevant area. I am adept at taking advantage of available resources, including precedent, applicable rules of procedure, treatises, legal scholarship, experts, and guidance from fellow practitioners. If confirmed, for criminal cases, and for any areas of the law for which I have had limited exposure, I intend to undertake in-depth study.

b. If you are confirmed, what resources will you use to get up to speed on criminal proceedings?

Response: Some of the many resources I will use include Title 18 of the U.S. Code governing crimes and criminal procedure, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines, Supreme Court and Fifth Circuit precedent, and respected treatises.

Questions for the Record for Anna St. John
Submitted by Senator Richard Blumenthal
February 11, 2026

1. In November 2021, at a House Judiciary Committee hearing regarding forced arbitration in sexual violence and harassment cases, you testified in support of such mandatory arbitration. In your written testimony, you wrote that "[a]llowing individuals to choose arbitration before a dispute arises is pro-employee" and that "[e]nacting a federal law barring individuals from seeking a private remedy turns these women into unwilling pawns, leveraging their private difficulties in pursuit of public policy objectives that don't actually benefit them."

    a. Do you still hold those views?

    Response: I disagree with the characterization that I testified in support of forced arbitration in sexual violence and harassment cases. My statement that allowing individuals to choose arbitration is pro-employee refers to the general ability of employees to choose their preferred method of dispute resolution—which may include arbitration or litigation or another dispute resolution procedure, in order to provide some control to employees and allow them to set their expectations and strategy should a dispute arise. My statement that enacting a federal law barring individuals from seeking a private remedy refers to the opposite of forced arbitration—forced litigation. I was making the point that arbitration has features that some women may prefer when making the difficult decision to hold wrongdoers accountable for sexual harassment, assault, or other unlawful conduct. For example, my testimony describes data showing that employees are more likely to win in arbitration than in court, arbitration tends to be faster and less expensive than litigation, and it is more informal and private than litigation. I do not believe that anyone subject to sexual violence or harassment should be forced to arbitrate those claims against their will at the sole election of their employer.

    b. If so, please explain why you believe forced arbitration in sexual violence and harassment cases is "pro-employee" and why a law banning that practice would not "actually benefit" those affected.

    Response: Please see my response above.

2. If confirmed, will you recuse yourself from any case where a reasonable person, knowing all the relevant facts, might question your impartiality, even if you personally believe you can be fair?

    Response: If confirmed, I will make recusal decisions in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 455, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and any other applicable laws, rules, ethics opinions, and practices governing conflicts of interest. In that regard, 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) states that "[a]ny justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States

shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned." Similarly, Canon 3(C) of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges states that "[a] judge shall disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, including but not limited to" several specific circumstances.

a. If confirmed, will you recuse yourself from cases involving individuals, organizations, or entities to which you or your family members have made political contributions or provided political support?

Response: Please see my response above.

b. If confirmed, will you recuse yourself from cases involving former clients, former law firms, or organizations with which you have had significant professional relationships?

Response: Please see my response above.

c. If confirmed, will you recuse yourself from cases involving personal friends, social acquaintances, or individuals with whom you have ongoing personal relationships?

Response: Please see my response above.

3. If confirmed, will you commit to avoiding all *ex parte* communications about pending cases, including informal discussions at social events or professional gatherings?

Response: If confirmed, I will follow the Judicial Code of Conduct and all other ethical rules and obligations governing ex parte communications. In that regard, Canon 3(A)(4) provides, with certain exceptions, that "a judge should not initiate, permit, or consider ex parte communications or consider other communications concerning a pending or impending matter that are made outside the presence of the parties or their lawyers. If a judge receives an unauthorized ex parte communication bearing on the substance of a matter, the judge should promptly notify the parties of the subject matter of the communication and allow the parties an opportunity to respond, if requested." Additionally, Canon 3(A)(6) provides that "[a] judge should not make public comment on the merits of a matter pending or impending in any court," though "[t]he prohibition on public comment on the merits does not extend to public statements made in the course of the judge's official duties, to explanations of court procedures, or to scholarly presentations made for purposes of legal education."

d. If confirmed, will you avoid discussing pending cases or judicial business with elected officials, political appointees, or political operatives?

Response: Please see my response above.

e. If confirmed, will you commit to declining meetings or communications with lobbyists, advocacy groups, or special interests seeking to influence your judicial decisions?

Response: Please see my response above.

f. If confirmed, will you refrain from making public statements about legal or political issues that could reasonably be expected to come before your court?

Response: Please see my response above.

4. If confirmed, will you commit to filing complete and accurate financial disclosure reports that include all required information about your financial interests and activities?

Response: Yes.

g. If confirmed, will you decline all gifts from parties who might appear before your court or who have interests that could be affected by your judicial decisions?

Response: If confirmed, I will follow Canon 4(D)(4) and "comply with the restrictions on acceptance of gifts and the prohibition on solicitation of gifts set forth in the Judicial Conference Gift Regulations," as well as all other ethical rules and obligations governing the acceptance or solicitation of gifts.

h. If confirmed, will you decline privately funded travel, hospitality, or entertainment that could create an appearance of impropriety or special access?

Response: Please see my response above.

i. If confirmed, will you ensure that any teaching, speaking, or writing activities comply with judicial ethics requirements and do not create conflicts with your judicial duties?

Response: Please see my response above.

5. The House Republican-authored budget reconciliation bill for Fiscal Year 2026 had included a provision that would have limited federal judges' ability to hold government officials in contempt. While the Senate Parliamentarian ruled that the provision violated the Byrd Rule, and it was, therefore, removed, it would have prohibited federal courts from issuing contempt penalties against officials who disobey preliminary injunctions or Temporary Restraining Orders if the party seeking the order did not provide financial security to cover potential future damages for wrongful enjoining.

The contempt power was first codified in law in the Judiciary Act of 1789. In 1873, the Supreme Court described it as "inherent in all courts" and "essential to the preservation of order in judicial proceedings and to the enforcement of the judgements, orders, and

writs of the courts, and consequently to the due administration of justice." Yet House Republicans are seeking to exempt government officials from this key tool for judicial enforcement.

a. Do you believe the contempt power is "essential . . . to the due administration of justice[?]"

Response: The U.S. Supreme Court made this statement in *Ex Parte Robinson*, 86 U.S. 505, 510 (1873). If confirmed, I would be bound by this and all other Supreme Court precedent governing the contempt power of the federal courts and would faithfully apply that precedent. As a judicial nominee, it would not be appropriate for me to comment regarding my views on Supreme Court precedent.

b. Do you believe that federal judges should be limited in their ability to hold government officials who defy court orders in contempt?

Response: Please see my response above.

6. If confirmed, you, like all other members of the federal bench, would have the ability to issue orders. On February 9, 2025, Vice President Vance posted on X that "[j]udges aren't allowed to control the executive's legitimate power." This raises an extremely concerning specter of Executive Branch defiance of court orders.

a. If confirmed, would you have the ability to issue orders?

Response: Yes.

i. Would you have the ability to enforce those orders?

Response: Yes.

ii. What powers would you have to enforce those orders?

Response: Courts have a number of methods available to enforce their orders. Those methods include sanctions, such as monetary sanctions, drawing certain inferences against a party, and public censure. They also include imposing certain oversight such as regular status reports. In serious cases, courts can exercise their contempt power.

b. Does there exist a legal basis for federal Executive Branch officials to defy federal court orders? If so, what basis and in which circumstances?

Response: All parties properly before a federal court are subject to court orders and must comply with those orders. There are certain well-established exceptions to this general principle, such as when a court lacked jurisdiction or if compliance is impossible. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Mine Workers*, 330 U.S. 258, 291 (1947).

c. Does there exist a legal basis for state officials to defy federal court orders? If so, what basis and in which circumstances?

Response: Please see my response above.

d. What would make a court order unlawful?

Response: A court order could be unlawful if the court lacked jurisdiction to issue the order. There may be additional circumstances in which a court order would be unlawful, but those circumstances are too numerous to list in the abstract.

i. What is the process a party should follow if it believes a court order to be unlawful?

Response: If a party believes a court order is unlawful, that party should move for reconsideration, move for a stay or deferral, and/or seek appellate review.

ii. Is it ever acceptable to not follow this process? When and why?

Response: Please see my response above.

7. Were you in Washington, D.C. on January 6, 2021?

Response: No.

a. Were you inside the U.S. Capitol or on the U.S. Capitol grounds on January 6, 2021?

Response: No.

Senator Mazie K. Hirono
Senate Judiciary Committee

Nomination Hearing
Questions for the Record for Anna E. Wagner St. John

1. You filed an amicus brief at the Hamilton Lincoln Law Institute in *303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*. In this case, someone claimed to want to develop websites despite never having done so before and pretended to be worried about having to design wedding websites for gay couples in order to challenge a Colorado antidiscrimination law.
    a. **Do you believe it is appropriate for parties to fabricate controversies in order to challenge laws they do not like?**

       Response: I am not familiar with the allegations that the litigant fabricated the controversy in *303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*. I believe all parties and attorneys should fulfill their duty of candor before a federal court.

2. **Is the right to access contraception settled law?**

   Response: The Supreme Court has extended constitutional protection to the use of contraceptives. *See Eisenstadt v. Baird*, 405 U.S. 438, 453-54 (1972); *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479, 485 (1965). I would faithfully apply those and all other precedents of the Supreme Court.

3. The Hamilton Lincoln Law Institute, which you lead, describes itself as a "public interest law firm dedicated to dismantling the progressive left's attacks on civil society."
    a. **Given that you are the leader of a firm with such a partisan mission, how can the public expect you to be impartial and fair, especially in cases with parties politically unaligned with your organization's mission?**

       Response: I disagree with that characterization, and, as a 501(c)(3) organization, Hamilton Lincoln Law Institute is strictly non-partisan, as required by IRS regulations. My work with the organization has focused on consumer protection and protecting the rule of law against federal overreach. If confirmed, I would no longer be acting as an advocate but instead would be called upon to apply legal standards faithfully and impartially. I understand the distinct roles of an advocate, from my own experience representing clients and advancing legal positions with which I may not personally agree, and the role of a judge. If I am confirmed, I will carefully and respectfully consider the arguments of the parties and I will remain committed to deciding cases without prejudgment. I will decide cases based on the law, rather than on my personal views or opinions on matters of policy.

4. **Does the 4th Amendment protection against unreasonable search and seizure and the 5th Amendment right to Due Process apply regardless of skin color?**

Response: Supreme Court precedent establishes that "the Constitution … forbids, so far as civil and political rights are concerned, discrimination by the General Government, or by the States, against any citizen because of his race." *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 499 (1954) (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, the Supreme Court has held that "[c]lassifications based solely upon race must be scrutinized with particular care, since they are contrary to our traditions and hence constitutionally suspect." *Id*. (holding that "racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial of the due process of law guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment").

Nomination of Anna St. John
United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
Questions for the Record
Submitted February 11, 2026

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BOOKER

1. The American Bar Association (ABA) Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has conducted extensive peer evaluations of the professional qualifications of a president's nominees to become federal judges for seven decades. This practice has endured through 18 presidential administrations, under Republican and Democratic presidents.

   On May 29, 2025, Attorney General Pam Bondi ended this longstanding practice when she informed the ABA that, "[T]he Office of Legal Policy will no longer direct nominees to provide waivers allowing the ABA access to nonpublic information, including bar records. Nominees will also not respond to questionnaires prepared by the ABA and will not sit for interviews with the ABA."[1]

   a. Do you agree with AG Bondi that "the ABA no longer functions as a fair arbiter of nominees' qualifications and its ratings invariably and demonstrably favor nominees put forth by Democratic administrations"?

      Response: As a judicial nominee, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the political question of the ABA's practice of conducting peer evaluations of the professional qualifications of a president's judicial nominees.

2. If this Committee were to establish that a sitting federal judge knowingly provided false testimony to this Committee, what do you believe the appropriate process and consequences should be?

   Response: As a judicial nominee, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on how this Committee should address a hypothetical situation in which a federal judge knowingly provided false testimony to the Committee.

3. If this Committee were to establish that a political appointee knowingly provided false testimony to this Committee, what do you believe the appropriate process and consequences should be?

   Response: As a judicial nominee, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on how this Committee should address a hypothetical situation in which a political appointee knowingly provided false testimony to the Committee.

4. How would you characterize your judicial philosophy?

[1] Letter from Attorney General Pam Bondi to William R. Bay, President, American Bar Association (May 29, 2025), https://www.justice.gov/ag/media/1402156/dl?inline.

Response: My judicial philosophy is that judges should apply the law faithfully and impartially, even when the result does not align with their personal preferences. Judges have a duty to exercise the judicial power and duties of Article III in accordance with the Constitution, their judicial oath of office, the Canons of Conduct for U.S. Judges, and all other applicable laws.

5. What do you understand originalism to mean?

   Response: Originalism is a method of constitutional interpretation by which a judge interprets a provision based upon the original public meaning.

6. Do you consider yourself an originalist?

   Response: If confirmed, I would interpret constitutional provisions by applying the methods of interpretation employed by the Supreme Court when it interprets those constitutional provisions. The Supreme Court has employed originalism to interpret the meaning of a number of constitutional provisions.

7. What do you understand textualism to mean?

   Response: Textualism is a method of legal interpretation by which judges interpret the law based upon the text as it was written, with the meaning it had at the time of its enactment.

8. Do you consider yourself a textualist?

   Response: Supreme Court precedent instructs that the best way to give effect to the people's will generally is by construing the words used in the text with the meaning those words had at the time they were enacted pursuant to the constitutionally prescribed lawmaking process. If confirmed, I would follow the interpretation methods and instructions of the Supreme Court, in the event there is no applicable precedent by which I am bound, in order to apply the law faithfully and impartially.

9. Legislative history refers to the record Congress produces during the process of passing a bill into law, such as detailed reports by congressional committees about a pending bill or statements by key congressional leaders while a law was being drafted. Some federal judges consider legislative history when analyzing the meaning of a statute.
   a. If you are confirmed to serve on the federal bench, would you consult and cite legislative history to analyze or interpret a federal statute?

      Response: Context surrounding a law's passage can be informative to a textualist interpretation to the extent it sheds light on the meaning of the statutory text at the time it was enacted.

   b. Do you believe that congressional intent matters when interpreting a statute? Why or why not.

Response: Supreme Court precedent instructs that congressional intent as set forth in the statute, such as under the headings "purposes" or "findings," as well as other indicia of intent such as section titles or captions, can be considered when analyzing the proper interpretation of a statutory provision. *See, e.g.*, *Yates v. United States*, 574 U.S. 528, 539 (2015).

10. According to an academic study, Black men were 65 percent more likely than similarly-situated white men to be charged with federal offenses that carry harsh mandatory minimum sentences.[2]

    a. What do you attribute this to?

    Response: These findings are certainly concerning; however, I am not familiar with the academic study and do not wish to speculate on the causes for its findings. If I am confirmed, I will apply the law, including criminal sentences, impartially and without regard to a defendant's race, and racial discrimination would have no place in my chambers, analysis, or rulings.

11. A recent report by the United States Sentencing Commission observed demographic differences in sentences imposed during the five-year period studied, with Black men receiving federal prison sentences that were 13.4 percent longer than white men.[3]

    a. What do you attribute this to?

    Please see my answer to Question 10.a.

12. What role do you think federal judges, who review difficult, complex criminal cases, can play in ensuring that a person's race did not factor into a prosecutor's decision or other instances where officials exercise discretion in our criminal justice system?

    Response: Judges have an obligation to ensure that the all participants in the criminal justice system are treated fairly and on an equal basis, without regard to a person's race. One way judges can ensure that race does not factor into an individual's treatment within the criminal justice system is by considering each case on its own merits and treating each criminal defendant individually. In addition, under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), judges also must consider as a sentencing factor "the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct."

13. Do you believe it is an important goal for there to be demographic diversity in the judicial branch? Why or why not.

---

[2] Sonja B. Starr & M. Marit Rehavi, *Racial Disparity in Federal Criminal Sentences*, 122 J. POL. ECON. 1320, 1323 (2014).

[3] U.S. SENTENCING COMM'N, DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN SENTENCING 2 (Nov. 2023), https://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/research-and-publications/research-publications/2023/20231114_Demographic-Differences.pdf.

Response: Yes, I believe it is important for judges from all demographics to be considered equally for positions in the judicial branch and for no one to be excluded on the basis of any protected characteristic. I believe that judges' exposure to a variety of opinions, experiences, and perspectives fosters a richer intellectual understanding of and ability to consider issues that may come before the court.

14. Please indicate whether you have ever published written material or made any public statements relating to the following topics. If so, provide a description of the written or public statement, the date and place/publication where the statement was made or published, and a summary of its subject matter. Mere reference to the list of publications and statements provided in your Senate Judiciary Questionnaire is insufficient; provide specific responses.

    If you have not disclosed a copy of the publication or a transcript of the statement to the Judiciary Committee, please attach a copy or link to the materials and please explain why you have not previously disclosed them.

    a. Abortion
    b. Affirmative action
    c. Contraceptives or birth control
    d. Gender-affirming care
    e. Firearms
    f. Immigration
    g. Same-sex marriage
    h. Miscegenation
    i. Participation of transgender people in sports
    j. Service of transgender people in the U.S. military
    k. Racial discrimination
    l. Sex discrimination
    m. Religious discrimination
    n. Disability discrimination
    o. Climate change or environmental disasters
    p. "DEI" or Diversity Equity and Inclusion

    Response: To the best of my knowledge, my Senate Judiciary Questionnaire, as supplemented in my February 3 and 4 letters to Chairman Grassley and Ranking Member Durbin, discloses all my responsive published writings and public statements. To the best of my recollection, my published writings and public statements have addressed some (but not all) of these topics. To discern which topics my published writings and public statements have addressed, I would consult my as-supplemented Questionnaire and the materials that I provided to the Committee.

15. Under what circumstances would it be acceptable for an executive branch official to ignore or defy a federal court order?

    Response: All parties properly before a federal court are subject to court orders and must comply with those orders. There are certain well-established exceptions to this general

principle, such as when a court lacked jurisdiction or if compliance is impossible. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Mine Workers*, 330 U.S. 258, 291 (1947).

a. If an executive branch official ignores or defies a federal court order, what legal analysis would you employ to determine whether that official should be held in contempt?

Response: I provide notice and an opportunity for the parties to be heard on the matter. I would consider the parties' arguments, including any defenses offered by the official, and analyze the terms of the order and the inaction or action of the official.

b. Is there any legal basis that would allow an executive branch official to ignore or defy temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions issued by federal district court judges? Please provide each one and the justification.

Response: Please see my responses above.

16. Does the president have the power to ignore or nullify laws passed by Congress?

Response: Article I, Section 7 of the Constitution gives the President the authority to veto legislation passed by Congress. The Take Care Clause in Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution provides that the President "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." How the President may exercise these or other constitutional powers implicates issues that could arise before me as a judge, if confirmed, and therefore would be inappropriate for me to comment on.

17. Does the president have the power to withhold funds appropriated by Congress?

Response: The Impoundment Control Act of 1974, 2 U.S.C. § 681, addresses how the President can delay or cancel the expenditure of appropriated funds. As a judicial nominee, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the President's constitutional powers particularly in an area that is the subject of ongoing litigation.

18. Does the president have the power to discriminate by withholding funds against state or local jurisdictions based on the political party of a jurisdiction's elected officials?

Response: Please see my response above.

19. Does the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution establish that federal laws supersede conflicting state laws?

Response: The Supreme Court has held that the Supremacy Clause establishes that federal laws supersede conflicting state laws. *See, e.g.*, *Haaland v. Brackeen*, 599 U.S. 255, 287 (2023).

20. Does the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution apply to non-citizens present in the United States?

    Response: The Fifth Amendment provides that "no shall any person … be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law…." The Supreme Court has interpreted the Due Process Clause to "appl[y] to all 'persons' within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is unlawful, temporary, or permanent." *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001). Questions of due process typically relate to the question of what process is due in a given situation. Consistent with the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on such questions which are a matter of political controversy and pending litigation.

21. Is it constitutional for Congress to delegate to federal agencies the power to implement statutes through rulemaking?

    Response: The Supreme Court has decided a number of cases addressing the constitutional limits on congressional delegation of rulemaking authority, *see Gundy v. United States*, 588 U.S. 128, 135-36 (2019), and this issue remains the subject of multiple ongoing cases. Consistent with the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on such questions which are a matter of political controversy and pending litigation.

22. Was *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), correctly decided?

    Response: Yes.

23. Is *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), binding precedent? Please describe the facts and holding of this case.

    Response: In *Griswold*, the Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment protects the use of contraceptives. *Griswold* is binding precedent, and, if confirmed, I would faithfully follow it and all other applicable Supreme Court precedents.

24. Is *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558 (2003), binding precedent? Please describe the facts and holding of this case.

    Response: In *Lawrence*, the Supreme court held that laws that criminalized sexual intimacy between members of the same sex violate the Fourteenth Amendment. *Lawrence* is binding precedent, and, if confirmed, I would faithfully follow it and all other applicable Supreme Court precedents.

25. Is *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644 (2015), binding precedent? Please describe the facts and holding of this case.

    Response: In *Obergefell*, the Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment requires a state to license marriages between two people of the same sex on the same terms and

conditions as marriages between two people of the opposite sex. *Obergefell* is binding precedent, and if confirmed, I would faithfully follow it and all other applicable Supreme Court precedents.

26. Do you believe that President Biden won the 2020 election? Note that this question is not asking who was certified as president in the 2020 election.

    Response: President Biden was certified as the winner of the 2020 election. Certification is the constitutionally prescribed process for prevailing in a presidential election.

    a. Did Biden win a majority of the electoral vote in the 2020 election?

       Response: Please see my response above.

    b. Do you believe that the results of the 2020 election, meaning the vote count, were accurate? If not, please provide why not and examples.

       Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on any controversy actively in litigation or on any subject of political controversy. President Biden was certified as the winner of the 2020 presidential election and served as president for four years.

27. The 22nd Amendment says that "no person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice."[4]

    a. Do you agree that President Trump was elected to the office of the President in the 2016 election?

       Response: Yes. President Trump was certified as the winner of the 2016 election, and the candidates did not dispute this outcome.

    b. Did Trump win a majority of the electoral vote in the 2016 election?

       Response: Please see my response above.

    c. Do you agree that President Trump was elected to the office of the President in the 2024 election?

       Response: Yes. President Trump was certified as the winner of the 2024 election, and the candidates did not dispute this election outcome.

    d. Did Trump win a majority of the electoral vote in the 2024 election?

       Response: Please see my response above.

[4] U.S. CONST. amend. XXII.

e. Do you agree that the 22nd Amendment, absent a constitutional amendment, prevents President Trump from running for a third presidential term?

Response: The Twenty-Second Amendment states that "No person shall be elected to the office of President more than twice." Under the text of this amendment, no one may be elected president for a third term.

28. Has any official from the White House or the Department of Justice, or anyone else involved in your nomination or confirmation process, instructed or suggested that you not opine on whether any past Supreme Court decisions were correctly decided?

Response: No.

29. Have you spoken or corresponded with Elon Musk since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

Response: No.

30. Have you spoken or corresponded with any member of the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) since November 2024? If yes, identify the member(s) and provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

Response: No, not to my knowledge.

31. Have you spoken or corresponded with Stephen Miller since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

Response: No.

32. Have you spoken or corresponded with Chad Mizelle since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

Response: No.

33. Have you spoken or corresponded with Pam Bondi since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

Response: No.

34. Have you spoken or corresponded with Todd Blanche since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

Response: When I was at the Department of Justice in preparation for my hearing, Mr. Blanche briefly attended and wished the nominees good luck.

35. Have you spoken or corresponded with Emil Bove since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

    Response: No.

36. Have you spoken or corresponded with Leonard Leo since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

    Response: No.

37. Have you—personally or through any of your affiliated companies or organizations, agents, or employees—provided financial support or other resources to any members of the Proud Boys or of the Oath Keepers for their legal fees or for other purposes? If yes, state the amount of financial support provided, dates provided, and for what purposes.

    Response: No.

38. Have you ever spoken or corresponded with any of the following individuals? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.
    a. Enrique Tarrio
    b. Stewart Rhodes
    c. Kelly Meggs
    d. Kenneth Harrelson
    e. Thomas Caldwell
    f. Jessica Watkins
    g. Roberto Minuta
    h. Edward Vallejo
    i. David Moerschel
    j. Joseph Hackett
    k. Ethan Nordean
    l. Joseph Biggs
    m. Zachary Rehl
    n. Dominic Pezzola
    o. Jeremy Bertino
    p. Julian Khater

    Response: No.

39. Have you ever spoken or corresponded with any individuals convicted and later pardoned of offenses related to the January 6, 2021 attack on the U.S. Capitol? If yes, identify the individual(s) and provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

    Response: No.

40. Federal judges must file annual financial disclosure reports and periodic transaction reports. If you are confirmed to the federal bench, do you commit to filing these disclosures and to doing so on time?

    Response: Yes.

41. Article III Project (A3P) "defends constitutionalist judges and the rule of law." According to Mike Davis, Founder & President of A3P, "I started the Article III Project in 2019 after I helped Trump win the Gorsuch and Kavanaugh fights. We saw then how relentless—and evil—too many of today's Democrats have become. They're Marxists who hate America. They believe in censorship. They have politicized and weaponized our justice systems."[5]

    a. Do you agree with the above statement?

        Response: Consistent with the Code of Judicial Conduct and positions taken by prior nominees, it would be inappropriate for me, as a judicial nominee, to comment on the statements of any political figure or on any subject of political controversy.

    b. Have you discussed any aspect of your nomination to the federal bench with any officials from or anyone directly associated with A3P, or did anyone do so on your behalf? If yes, identify the individual(s) and provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

        Response: No, not to my knowledge.

    c. Are you currently in contact with anyone associated with A3P? If so, who?

        Response: No.

    d. Have you ever been in contact with anyone associated with A3P? If so, who?

        Response: Before A3P was founded, I worked with Will Chamberlain, whom I understand from public reports is involved with A3P. To the best of my recollection, I have not been in personal contact with Mr. Chamberlain since before he became associated with A3P.

42. Since you were first approached about the possibility of being nominated, did anyone associated with the Trump Administration or Senate Republicans provide you guidance or advice about which cases to list on your Senate Judiciary Questionnaire (SJQ)?

    a. If so, who? What advice did they give?

        Response: The Department of Justice provided general guidance for my selection of cases to list on my SJQ. I made my own decisions about which cases to list.

[5] https://www.article3project.org/about

b. Did anyone suggest that you omit or include any particular case or type of case in your SJQ?

Response: Please see my response above.

43. During your selection process did you talk with any officials from or anyone directly associated with the Article III Project, or did anyone do so on your behalf? If so, what was the nature of those discussions?

Response: No, not to my knowledge.

44. During your selection process did you talk with any officials from or anyone directly associated with the Federalist Society, or did anyone do so on your behalf? If so, what was the nature of those discussions?

Response: During my selection process, I served on the Federalist Society's Free Speech Executive Committee, and I have numerous friends and professional acquaintances who are among the thousands of individuals associated with the Federalist Society. Certain of these friends and professional acquaintances were involved in my background check, and, as a result, I kept them generally apprised of significant developments in my selection process.

45. Please explain, with particularity, the process whereby you answered these written questions, including whether you personally drafted initial responses and whether anyone helped draft, review, or edit the answers.

Response: I personally drafted initial responses to these written questions, after reviewing a few responses submitted by previous nominees in order to familiarize myself with the general format, length, and content considered appropriate and responsive. I then submitted my responses to the Office of Legal Policy for feedback. I then finalized my responses for submission to the Committee.

Senator Peter Welch
Senate Judiciary Committee
Written Questions for Anna Elizabeth St. John
Hearing on "Nominations"
Wednesday, February 4, 2026

1. In November 2021, you testified at a House Judiciary Committee hearing titled, "Silenced: How Forced Arbitration Keeps Victims of Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment in the Shadows."

    a. During that hearing, you testified that "there have been examples where workers have asked for [forced arbitration] clauses to be taken out of contracts and they have been successful. So, the idea that it is really forced I don't think is borne out by the facts." Please explain what you meant by this statement.

    Response: I believe my statement referred to employees successfully negotiating to remove clauses selecting arbitration ex ante as the process for resolving disputes from employment contracts.

    b. Does the Hamilton Lincoln Law Institute, which you lead as its President and General Counsel, ask its employees to sign arbitration clauses for employment-related disputes? If so, how many employees have signed such agreements and how many employees have successfully negotiated the removal of that clause?

    Response: Hamilton Lincoln Law Institute does not ask employees to sign arbitration clauses for employment-related disputes.

2. You previously worked at the Center for Class Action Fairness. According to your Hamilton Lincoln Law Institute biography page, your prior work involved challenging what you describe as "class action abuse[s]." Could you please describe the class actions you challenged and the basis for each challenge.

    Response: Class action abuse comes in many forms. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, class action settlements require court approval, unlike settlements in traditional bilateral cases, because of the inherent risk that the defendant and the plaintiffs' attorneys will reach a settlement that favors their mutual interests at the expense of the absent class members. Thus, a district court may approve a class action settlement "only on finding that it is fair, reasonable, and adequate," and may award only "reasonable" attorneys' fees.

Among the abuses that I have challenged are cases in which the settling parties have created an illusion of relief rather than actual relief to the class: a settlement that appears to provide significant relief to the class to justify a large fee award, but actually minimizes defendant's total payout. As a result, while the absolute size of a settlement may be fair, the allocation may be unfair, and courts often fail to recognize the self-dealing or the illusory nature of the relief to the detriment of consumer and shareholder class members. *See, e.g.*, *Kurtz v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 142 F.4th 112 (2d Cir. 2025) (vacating settlement that paid less than $1 million to the class while the attorneys were paid $3 million). Another abuse I have litigated are cases in which the defendants and plaintiffs' attorneys have agreed to pay the settlement funds, which arise from the class members' injuries, to uninjured third parties with no connection to the case, including organizations for which they serve as board members, their alma maters, and the like. *See, e.g.*, *Frank v. Gaos*, 586 U.S. 485 (2019) (vacating settlement; on remand settlement funds were distributed to class members). Another abuse I have litigated are so-called "strike suits," filed in the wake of merger announcements for the sole purpose of eliciting attorneys' fees from the defendant rather than obtaining any relief beneficial to the class. *See Alcarez v. Akorn, Inc.*, 99 F.4th 386 (7th Cir. 2024).

3. In 2024, you stated that the Supreme Court should reexamine the "onerous" test it laid out in *New York Times v. Sullivan* regarding defamation suits. Please explain what you meant by this statement and what legal test you believe should apply in defamation claims.

   Response: My statement is explained in the context of the article quoted in the question, and referenced the different tests applied to private and public figures in defamation cases. If I am confirmed, I would be bound by the legal test set forth in *New York Times v. Sullivan* and all other Supreme Court precedent.