

## H.R. 1789, Promptly Ending Political Prosecutions and Executive Retaliation Act of 2025

As reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary on March 21, 2025

By Fiscal Year, Millions of Dollars		2025	2025-2030	2025-2035
Direct Spending (Outlays)		*	*	*
Revenues		*	*	*
Increase or Decrease (-) in the Deficit		*	*	*
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)		*	*	not estimated
Increases <i>net direct spending</i> in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036?	< \$2.5 billion	Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply?		Yes
		<b>Mandate Effects</b>		
Increases <i>on-budget deficits</i> in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036?	No	Contains intergovernmental mandate?		No
		Contains private-sector mandate?		No
* = between -\$500,000 and \$500,000.				

H.R. 1789 would allow a current or former President or Vice President to remove to federal court a civil action or criminal prosecution brought against them in a state court. Under current law, the option for removal is limited to cases where the defendant is a federal official or an officer of the legislative or judicial branch, acting in an official capacity. In addition, the bill would create a presumption of legal immunity for those officials, establish procedures and standards of evidence for removal of proceedings, and authorize the Attorney General to represent or pay for private representation of officials who are the subject of a charge or claim. The legislation would apply to cases that are pending on the date of enactment and those filed in state courts thereafter.

CBO expects that cases that are removed from state to federal courts under the bill would result in additional costs for the federal judiciary. There is significant uncertainty surrounding the number of cases that would be removed and the duration of the resulting litigation. Using information from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, CBO estimates that the cost of removing those cases to federal court would be less than \$500,000 over the 2025-2030 period. That spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

See also

[CBO's Cost Estimates Explained](#), [CBO Describes Its Cost-Estimating Process](#), [Glossary](#)



In addition, any payments made by the Attorney General to compensate private counsel retained by officials who are the subject of a charge or claim would be recorded in the budget as direct spending. There is significant uncertainty surrounding the number of cases that would be removed, the duration of resulting litigation, and the extent to which the Department of Justice would pay for private counsel. Because CBO expects that the number of affected cases would be small, any increase in direct spending would be insignificant.

Litigants in state courts also would need to pay a filing fee to remove their case to federal court. Such fees are recorded in the budget as revenues, and courts can spend those fees without further appropriation. Because CBO expects that the number of affected cases would be small, CBO estimates that the effect on direct spending and revenues would be insignificant.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jon Sperl. The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Phillip L. Swagel", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Phillip L. Swagel  
Director, Congressional Budget Office