

Garcia (CA)	McBath	Sánchez	Davidson	Jack	Nunn (IA)	Matsui	Perez	Stanton			
Garcia (IL)	McBride	Scanlon	De La Cruz	Jackson (TX)	Obornolte	McBath	Peters	Stevens			
Garcia (TX)	McClain Delaney	Schakowsky	DesJarlais	James	Ogles	McBride	Pettersen	Strickland			
Gillen	McClellan	Schneider	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (LA)	Onder	McClain Delaney	Pingree	Subramanyam			
Golden (ME)	McCollum	Scholten	Donalds	Johnson (SD)	Owens	McClellan	Pocan	Suozi			
Goldman (NY)	McDonald Rivet	Schrier	Downing	Jordan	Palmer	McCollum	Pou	Swalwell			
Gomez	McGarvey	Scott (VA)	Dunn (FL)	Joyce (OH)	Patronis	McDonald Rivet	Pressley	Sykes			
Gonzalez, V.	McGovern	Scott, David	Edwards	Joyce (PA)	Perry	McGarvey	Quigley	Takano			
Goodlander	McIver	Sewell	Elizay	Kean	Pfluger	McGovern	Ramirez	Thanedar			
Gray	Meeks	Sherman	Emmer	Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler	McIver	Randall	Thompson (CA)			
Green, Al (TX)	Menendez	Sherrill	Estes	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Meeks	Raskin	Thompson (MS)			
Harder (CA)	Meng	Simon	Evans (CO)	Kennedy (UT)	Rogers (KY)	Menendez	Riley (NY)	Titus			
Hayes	Mfume	Smith (WA)	Ezell	Kiggans (VA)	Rose	Meng	Rivas	Tlaib			
Himes	Min	Sorensen	Fallon	Kiley (CA)	Rouzer	Mfume	Ross	Tokuda			
Horsford	Moore (WI)	Soto	Fedorchak	Kim	Roy	Min	Ruiz	Tonko			
Houlahan	Morelle	Stansbury	Feenstra	Knott	Rulli	Moore (WI)	Ryan	Torres (CA)			
Hoyer	Morrison	Stanton	Fine	Kustoff	Rutherford	Morelle	Salinas	Torres (NY)			
Hoyle (OR)	Moskowitz	Stevens	Finstad	LaHood	Salazar	Morrison	Sánchez	Trahan			
Huffman	Moulton	Strickland	Fischbach	LaLota	Scalise	Moskowitz	Scanlon	Tran			
Ivey	Mrvan	Subramanyam	Fitzgerald	LaMalfa	Schmidt	Moulton	Schakowsky	Underwood			
Jackson (IL)	Mullin	Suozi	Fitzpatrick	Langworthy	Schweikert	Mrvan	Schneider	Vargas			
Jacobs	Nadler	Swalwell	Fleischmann	Latta	Scott, Austin	Mullin	Scholten	Vasquez			
Jayapal	Neal	Sykes	Flood	Lawler	Self	Nadler	Schrier	Veasey			
Jeffries	Neguse	Takano	Fox	Lee (FL)	Sessions	Neal	Scott (VA)	Velázquez			
Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Thanedar	Franklin, Scott	Letlow	Shreve	Neguse	Scott, David	Vindman			
Johnson (TX)	Olshewski	Thompson (CA)	Fry	Loudermilk	Simpson	Ocasio-Cortez	Sewell	Wasserman			
Kamlager-Dove	Omar	Thompson (MS)	Fulcher	Lucas	Smith (MO)	Olshewski	Sherman	Schultz			
Kaptur	Pallone	Titus	Garbarino	Luna	Smith (NE)	Omar	Sherrill	Waters			
Keating	Panetta	Tlaib	Gill (TX)	Luttrell	Smith (NJ)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman			
Kelly (IL)	Pappas	Tokuda	Gimenez	Mace	Smucker	Panetta	Sorensen	Whitesides			
Kennedy (NY)	Pelosi	Tonko	Goldman (TX)	Mackenzie	Spartz	Pappas	Soto	Williams (GA)			
Khanna	Perez	Torres (CA)	Gonzales, Tony	Malliotakis	Stauber	Pelosi	Stansbury	Wilson (FL)			
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Torres (NY)	Gooden	Maloy	Steil	NOT VOTING—9					
Landsman	Pettersen	Trahan	Gosar	Mann	Steube						
Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Tran	Graves	Massie	Strong	Bice	Fong	Norcross			
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Underwood	Green (TN)	Mast	Stutzman	Buchanan	Gottheimer	Simon			
Latimer	Pou	Vargas	Greene (GA)	McCaul	Taylor	Comer	Miller (WV)	Stefanik			
Lee (NV)	Pressley	Vasquez	Griffith	McClain	Tenney	□ 1520					
Lee (PA)	Quigley	Veasey	Grothman	McClintock	Thompson (PA)						
Leger Fernandez	Ramirez	Velázquez	Guest	McCormick	Tiffany	So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.					
Levin	Randall	Vindman	Guthrie	McDowell	Timmons						
Liccardo	Raskin	Wasserman	Hageman	McGuire	Turner (OH)	A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.					
Lieu	Riley (NY)	Schultz	Hamadeh (AZ)	Messmer	Valadao						
Lofgren	Rivas	Waters	Haridopolos	Meuser	Van Drew	Stated against: Ms. SIMON. Madam Speaker, I missed the					
Lynch	Ross	Watson Coleman	Harrigan	Miller (IL)	Van Dwyne						
Magaziner	Ruiz	Whitesides	Harris (MD)	Miller (OH)	Van Orden	The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.					
Mannion	Ryan	Williams (GA)	Harris (NC)	Miller-Meeks	Wagner						
Matsui	Salinas	Wilson (FL)	Harshbarger	Mills	Walberg	The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.					
NOT VOTING—9			Hern (OK)	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)						
			Higgins (LA)	Moore (AL)	Webster (FL)	Alford					
NOES—211			Hudson	Newhouse	Yakym						
			Issa	Norman	Zinke						
Adams			Costa								
Aguilar			Courtney								
Amo			Craig								
Ansari			Crockett								
Auchincloss			Crow								
Balint			Cuellar								
Barragán			Davids (KS)								
Beatty			Davis (IL)								
Bell			Davis (NC)								
Bera			Dean (PA)								
Beyer			DeGette								
Biggs (AZ)			DeLauro								
Bishop			DelBene								
Bonamici			Deluzio								
Boyle (PA)			DeSaulnier								
Brown			Dexter								
Brownley			Dingell								
Budzinski			Doggett								
Bynum			Elfreh								
Carbajal			Escobar								
Carson			Españat								
Carter (LA)			Evans (PA)								
Castro (FL)			Fields								
Castro (TX)			Figures								
Cherfilus-			Fletcher								
McCormick			Friedman								
Chu			Frost								
Cisneros			Garamendi								
Clark (MA)			Garcia (CA)								
Clarke (NY)			Garcia (IL)								
Cleave			Garcia (TX)								
Clyburn			Gillen								
Cohen			Golden (ME)								
Conaway			Goldman (NY)								
Connolly			Gomez								
Correa			Gonzalez, V.								

the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 300

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE: Mr. Fine.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Patonis.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Patonis.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NO ROGUE RULINGS ACT OF 2025

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 294, I call up the bill (H.R. 1526) to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the authority of district courts to provide injunctive relief, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1526

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the “No Rogue Rulings Act of 2025” as the “NORRA of 2025”.*

**SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS TO PROVIDE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 1370. Limitation on authority to provide injunctive relief**

*“(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), notwithstanding any other provision of law, no United States district court shall issue any order providing for injunctive relief, except in the case of such an order that is applicable only to limit the actions of a party to the case before such district court with respect to the party seeking injunctive relief from such district court and non-parties represented by such a party acting in a representative capacity pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.*

*“(b) If a case is brought by two or more States located in different circuits challenging an action by the executive branch, that case shall be referred to a three-judge panel selected pursuant to section 2284, except that the selection of judges shall be random, and not by the chief judge of the circuit. The three-judge panel may issue an injunction that would otherwise be prohibited under subsection (a), and shall consider the interest of justice, the risk of irreparable harm to non-parties, and the preservation of the constitutional separation of powers in determining whether to issue such an order.*

*“(c) An appeal of an order granting or denying injunctive relief pursuant to subsection (b) may lie to the circuit embracing the district or to the Supreme Court, at the preference of the party.”.*

(b) *TABLE OF SECTIONS.*—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

*“1370. Limitation on authority to provide injunctive relief.”.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1526.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in recent years it has become glaringly obvious that Federal judges are overstepping their constitutional bounds under Article III of the Constitution which applies that lower courts are created under statute by Congress. Pursuant to congressional action, district judges are limited to the plaintiff before them that has nexus in their district.

Madam Speaker, in short, that means that a district judge needs to be confined to their district and to people who are in their district. Case after case, over decades, has shown that when they fail to do so, the cases are thrown out.

More importantly, if they were to continue to do what is generally called nationwide injunctions, then, in fact, there would be no need for a 5–4 or 6–3 decision by the High Court. The High Court of nine must reach a majority in order to make something the law of the land, and yet a single district judge believes they can make the law of the land.

□ 1530

Since President Trump has returned to office, left-leaning activists have cooperated with ideological judges whom they have sought out to take their cases and weaponized nationwide injunctions to stall dozens of lawful executive actions and initiatives.

Proof of that occurred just yesterday when, by a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, yet another judge’s national ban was overturned.

These actions touch on many of the most critical issues facing our country, such as securing our borders, reforming insufficient and ineffective government bureaucracy, and strengthening our military.

Let me be absolutely clear. These sweeping injunctions represent judicial

activism at its worst. Don’t just take my word for it, Madam Speaker. As late as October of last year, the Solicitor General of the Biden administration urged the end of these practices, stating that, in fact, the Biden administration has to win every time, but the opposition only has to win one out of even one dozen cases. That is exactly the problem we are facing.

The Supreme Court regularly considers cases that are done in the ordinary course where one district judge, and perhaps a jury, rules one way and another rules another way, and the courts, through the appellate process, come up with a single law of the land. However, they do so looking at the arguments of both winning and losing, and they do so while the administration is not nationally and internationally banned.

National injunctions are being used to halt executive actions and executive orders not just for plaintiffs before the court but across the entire country, including individuals and entities that are not even parties to the litigation and, in many cases, may not favor the outcome and would not have been willing plaintiffs.

This undermines the system of government. It empowers individual, unelected judges to dictate national policy and to thwart the Constitution to take rights reserved to Congress and the President of the United States.

NORRA, the No Rogue Rulings Act, puts an end to this type of abuse. Under NORRA, we reaffirm the principles that district court orders can only bind parties before the court and not nonparties across the country. This reform will also discourage the growing trend to forum shop, Madam Speaker. If you can go to Hawaii because you can find a judge who will rule against an action taken here in the District of Columbia, then you will do so if you can get a nationwide injunction. If you can only enjoin individuals who may not even be affected by it, then there is no incentive to do so.

Madam Speaker, there are 677 current judge positions not including those on senior status. There are 677 individuals, each of whom can exceed their authority and stymie the legitimate actions of government. In some cases, these judges have even ordered the payment of amounts when the administration has determined that there is great risk of fraud.

During the last administration, they objected to this. They tried to stop it. Even in the last days before the election, the Biden administration was doing everything they could to accomplish what we are doing here today. In fact, there was even legislation in the last Congress authored by Democrats to do it.

This is not a partisan issue. It may be a timely issue for this President, but that does not make it partisan. To do the right thing at this time is critical.