

On June 29, 2026, President Trump nominated Gregory Cook to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. Cook is a lifelong conservative who has consistently aligned himself with extremist ideologies in pursuit of more political power. Though he brands himself as a level-headed textualist, his track record demonstrates a commitment to corporate interests and the spread of conservative ideology — not justice.

In law school, Cook authored a paper praising Justice Scalia's traditionalist approach and has expressed admiration for Justice Thomas, lauding justices whose ultra-conservative jurisprudence has been used to justify some of the most harmful Supreme Court decisions in recent history. After graduating, he joined Balch & Bingham, where he regularly advised big businesses on how to squash consumer lawsuits and evade accountability.

Cook has also spent years advancing Republican causes, especially with the Alabama GOP, where he has volunteered as legal counsel for decades. In 2021, he capitalized on these connections and ran as a Republican for a seat on the Alabama Supreme Court. Backed primarily by business groups and endorsed by the anti-abortion group, Alabama Citizens for Life, Cook won his election and has served on the court ever since. During his campaign, Cook positioned himself as an anti-woke hero and a line of defense against so-called voter fraud.

Additionally, Cook has demonstrated that he is not capable of being an impartial or independent judge. While campaigning for his Alabama Supreme Court seat, he referred to Republicans as “the last great hope for America” and asserted that “any Republican is better than any Democrat” — signaling partisanship over qualifications. Cook also revealed his unfettered loyalty to Trump, by referring to himself as being “Trump-Tough.” He also described Trump's 2024 reelection as a “wonderful relief” because “wokeness” was “finally losing ground.” Although Cook characterizes himself as a “predictable and boring” public servant focused on the rule of law, his track record demonstrates that this persona is merely a smokescreen intended to veil his true priority: corporate-beholden conservatism.

ADVOCATED AGAINST CONSUMER PROTECTIONS AND CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Before becoming a judge, Cook spent the majority of his three-decade legal career advocating for large corporations and against consumers. He authored dozens of articles and practice guides on how big businesses could skirt accountability for predatory practices. He has helped businesses learn how to weaponize forced arbitration clauses, further decreasing transparency and accountability when corporations hurt people. In his writings, Cook frames consumer protections as “zealous policing” and accountability as “unlocking the floodgates” to more litigation. Instead of prioritizing justice for those harmed, Cook seems more concerned with increased risks of litigation for businesses.

ADVOCATED AGAINST CONSUMER PROTECTIONS AND CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY (CONT.)

In addition, Cook has supported efforts to make it harder for people who have been hurt in similar ways to combine their cases in class action suits, weakening accountability for violations of state laws such as the Alabama Deceptive Trade Practices Act. For smaller dollar harms that may not make financial sense to pursue individually, combining similar cases together in this way helps level the playing field against powerful corporations that might otherwise be able to avoid accountability when they cause harm or rip people off.

He also represented multiple Wall Street banks in their effort to invalidate a consolidation of 62 class actions related to PPP loans. If confirmed for a lifetime seat on the federal bench, Cook's demonstrated biases against consumer protections could further expose and hurt the many Alabamians living paycheck to paycheck, struggling even with basic living expenses.

WORKED TO RESTRICT VOTING ACCESS

Cook has pushed for restrictive voter-ID laws, even as evidence continues to show that such laws do not cut down on voter fraud and serve only to make it more difficult for everyday people to exercise one of their most fundamental rights. He criticized Georgia for only enforcing their voter-ID law for in-person voting and not mail-in or absentee ballots in the 2020 election, which he claimed permit widespread voter fraud. Cook also praised Alabama's highly restrictive voter-ID laws, which are required for all types of voting.

In 2014, these laws made it harder for 250,000 registered Alabama voters to access the ballot box, as they lacked the photo ID required to vote. Perhaps by design, these restrictions disproportionately impact Black and Latino citizens at 3x and 2x higher rates respectively due to systemic barriers coupled with decades of racist policies and practices. Cook's support for these exclusionary policies would further entrench existing barriers that prevent Black and brown citizens' ability to exercise their fundamental right to vote.

Cook has also positioned himself as an election-law expert who believes in extreme election security, often citing his experiences in the 2000 *Bush v. Gore* recount as a volunteer attorney and as a lawyer for the Alabama Republican Party. However, Cook has made multiple inaccurate claims about presidential elections, belying the idea that election integrity is his top priority.

WORKED TO RESTRICT VOTING ACCESS (CONT.)

Cook claimed that during the 2020 election, states like Pennsylvania did not follow their election laws, likely referencing curing inconsistencies between some Pennsylvania counties. Curing is the process of allowing a voter to fix mistakes in their mail-in or absentee ballot so that their vote still counts. In 2020, some counties allowed curing, while some did not. Republicans claimed that Democrat-majority counties violated state law by giving voters the opportunity to fix their ballots. However, not only were some Republican-majority counties allowing voters to cure, Pennsylvania election law does not prohibit it. Despite claiming that allegations of unsound elections undermine democracy and reduce the effectiveness of elected officials like himself, Cook has done just that by repeatedly making unfounded claims about Pennsylvania.

Furthermore, Cook claimed that during the 2000 election, he “represented conservative interests” while liberal activists tried to “steal” the election and “decide the president.” But a few years later, while discussing his experience in the Florida recount, he acknowledged the race was just an “incredibly close election” despite allegations of inaccurate voting machines. Cook frames himself as a conservative “grounded in principle,” but after frequently making baseless accusations about these elections, Trump chose him as a delegate for the 2020 election and then nominated him for a federal district judge position. Cook’s principles begin and end with personal gain.

Anyone confirmed for a lifetime role on the federal judiciary must demonstrate a commitment to fairness, independence, and equal justice for all. They must value a commitment to the Constitution above all else, including any political party, political biases, or Trump. Gregory Cook’s background and writings do not exhibit these qualities. Instead, he has spent his life’s work siding with powerful and wealthy interests at the expense of the communities he would be charged with serving. He worked to undermine marginalized communities’ access to the ballot box due to unfounded and disproven fears of so-called “voter fraud.” For these reasons, Cook remains unfit and unqualified to serve as a judge for the Northern District of Alabama.