



Eleven Dupont Circle NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036
www.afj.org | 202-822-6070

Field Offices
Dallas | Houston | Los Angeles |
San Francisco

PRESIDENT

Rachel Rossi

CHAIR

Madeline deLone

October 21, 2025

Senator Charles Grassley
Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee

Senator Richard Durbin
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee

Dear Chairman Grassley and Ranking Member Durbin,

On behalf of the Alliance for Justice (AFJ), a national association representing nearly 140 public interest and civil rights organizations, we firmly urge you and your colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee to reject the nomination of William “Will” Crain to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Crain’s record on the Louisiana Supreme Court reveals a pattern of ideological extremism, hostility toward civil liberties, and a contempt for defendant protections. A lifetime role on the federal bench would turn his far-right views into constitutional precedent, threatening our fundamental rights and further undermining public trust in a fair and independent judiciary.

Previously, Crain ran as “the most conservative choice” and promoted both anti-abortion and pro-gun stances. His record as a Louisiana Supreme Court Justice further deepens concerns about his ability to serve a lifetime appointment in which he must interpret the rule of law with no deference to his personal preferences. Meanwhile, Crain has consistently ruled against defendants’ rights, undermined access to justice, and shielded corporate interests from accountability. In his dissent in State v. Quandarious Rowe, he ruled against immunity for persons experiencing drug overdoses, a perspective that reflects a disregard for public health interventions designed to preserve life. Furthermore, his public statements equating social justice principles to “lawless decisions” and disparaging proponents as lacking devotion to the country reveals a worldview unconcerned with equality, dignity, and fair treatment under law.

On reproductive rights, Crain dissented from a Louisiana Supreme Court temporary injunction that protected abortion providers in June Medical Services, LLC v. Landry and called for immediate enforcement of restrictive statutes. His use of language like “alleged life” signals adherence to the extreme far-right fetal-personhood ideology, further seeking to cement a foundation that would strip away constitutionally protected rights based on his personal moral judgments. That view is incompatible with the constitutional right to reproductive freedom, and such positions risk being used to justify radical reinterpretations of law that even further eliminate critical reproductive healthcare rights.

Crain's criminal and civil jurisprudence reveal an alarming disregard for police accountability and support for rigid punishment. In State v. Thomas, he dissented from a decision granting relief to a defendant whose counsel performed ineffectively, ignoring claims of prejudice and deficiencies that violated Sixth Amendment protections. In State v. K.B., he argued police were justified in stopping and searching a juvenile with no suspicion — an approach that conflicts with Fourth Amendment guardrails and would further harmful practices that disproportionately burden communities of color. In State v. Draughn and State v. Alexander, his dissents prioritized procedural technicalities over substantive justice, even when convictions lacked sufficient evidence or merited post-conviction review. And in State v. Pierce, he would have upheld an extreme mandatory minimum of 66 years, rejecting any consideration of mitigating circumstances such as age, addiction, or family hardship.

Throughout these decisions, Crain demonstrates an entrenched judicial approach that supports a punitive justice system, process over fairness, and the oppressive components of state power over individual rights.

Finally, Crain has sided with corporate polluters over affected communities. In State ex rel. Tureau v. BEPCO, L.P., he dissented from a decision that allowed landowners to hold fossil fuel companies accountable when their conduct damaged land. By cutting off access to accountability, Crain left Louisiana communities without a remedy for polluted land. Crain's rhetoric and judicial opinions demonstrate a willingness to be swayed by partisan interest, to sacrifice constitutional neutrality on behalf of ideological ends, and to view certain communities with disdain.

The Senate has a duty to ensure the federal bench is reserved for jurists who will administer our laws fairly and independently — not ideologues seeking to remake constitutional law from the bench. Confirming William Crain would bestow a lifetime appointment to the federal bench for a nominee who has shown persistent hostility to civil rights and who appears prepared to wield federal authority in service of a predetermined agenda. His confirmation would erode public confidence in the judiciary's impartiality and jeopardize the rights of litigants who come before him.

For these reasons, the Alliance for Justice firmly urges you to oppose his nomination.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rachel Rossi".

Rachel Rossi
President, Alliance for Justice