

LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, SOUTH CAROLINA  
JOHN CORNYN, TEXAS  
MICHAEL S. LEE, UTAH  
TED CRUZ, TEXAS  
JOSH HAWLEY, MISSOURI  
THOM TILLIS, NORTH CAROLINA  
JOHN KENNEDY, LOUISIANA  
MARSHA BLACKBURN, TENNESSEE  
ERIC SCHMITT, MISSOURI  
KATIE BOYD BRITT, ALABAMA  
MIKE CRAPO, IDAHO

RICHARD J. DURBIN, ILLINOIS  
SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, RHODE ISLAND  
AMY KLOBUCHAR, MINNESOTA  
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, DELAWARE  
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, CONNECTICUT  
MAZIE HIRONO, HAWAII  
CORY A. BOOKER, NEW JERSEY  
ALEX PADILLA, CALIFORNIA  
PETER WELCH, VERMONT  
ADAM B. SCHIFF, CALIFORNIA

## United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6275

January 28, 2025

### VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

The Honorable Donald J. Trump  
President of the United States

Dear President Trump:

We write to you today concerning the reported firing of Inspectors General (IGs) from 18 offices.<sup>1</sup> Congress was not provided the legally required 30-day notice and case-specific reasons for removal, as required by law.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we request that you provide that information immediately.

On December 23, 2022, the “James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023” was signed into law and included provisions from the *Securing Inspector General Independence Act*, which was introduced by a bipartisan group of members.<sup>3</sup> Those provisions require that the President “shall” communicate to Congress in writing 30 days before removing or transferring an IG from office the “substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons” for the removal or transfer.<sup>4</sup> The law also prohibits an IG from being placed on non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date of removal or transfer unless the continued presence of the Inspector General in the workplace poses a threat as described by requirements in the Administrative Leave Act and the President submits a report to Congress.<sup>5</sup>

While IGs aren’t immune from committing acts requiring their removal, and they can be removed by the president, the law must be followed.<sup>6</sup> The communication to Congress must contain more than just broad and vague statements, rather it must include sufficient facts and details to assure Congress and the public that the termination is due to real concerns about the Inspector General’s ability to carry out their mission.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Yamiche Alcindor, Vaughn Hillyard and Laura Strickler, *Trump fires 18 inspectors general overnight in legally murky move*, NBC News (Jan. 25, 2025) <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/white-house/trump-fires-multiple-inspectors-general-legally-murky-overnight-move-rcna189261>.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*; see Pub. L. 117-263.

<sup>3</sup> See S. 587, Securing Inspector General Independence Act of 2021, 117<sup>th</sup> Congress (introduced Mar. 4, 2021) <https://www.congress.gov/bills/117th-congress/senate-bill/587/text>.

<sup>4</sup> Pub. L. 117-263.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*; see 5 U.S.C. § 6329b(b)(2)(A)(i)-(iv) (2) Requirements.—An agency may place an employee in leave under paragraph (1) only if the agency has—(A) made a determination with respect to the employee that the continued presence of the employee in the workplace during an investigation of the employee or while the employee is in a notice period, as applicable, may— (i) pose a threat to the employee or others; (ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; (iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; or (iv) otherwise jeopardize legitimate Government interests.

<sup>6</sup> Pub. L. 117-263.

<sup>7</sup> Pub. L. 117-263.

This is a matter of public and congressional accountability and ensuring the public's confidence in the Inspector General community, a sentiment shared more broadly by other Members of Congress. IGs are critical to rooting out waste, fraud, abuse, and misconduct within the Executive Branch bureaucracy, which you have publicly made clear you are also intent on doing.

Accordingly, we request that you provide Congress with a written communication that contains the "substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons" for each of the IG's removed. Further, we request the name of each official that will serve in an acting capacity and that you work quickly to nominate qualified and non-partisan individuals to serve in these open positions.

Sincerely,



Charles E. Grassley  
Chairman  
Committee on the Judiciary



Richard J. Durbin  
Ranking Member  
Committee on the Judiciary