

PRESS ADVISORY

For Immediate Release

December 10, 2025

Federal Judge Seeks Government Response to Address New Evidence of White House End-Run on Federal Building Demolitions; Presses GSA to Expand Commitments in Eisenhower Executive Office Building Case

On Monday, Judge Dabney Friedrich issued a series of directives following Monday's hearing in *Cultural Heritage Partners et al. v. Trump et al.*, the lawsuit seeking to require the Administration to follow federal law before executing the President's plan to clean, repoint, and paint the Eisenhower Executive Office Building ("EEOB"). Key developments are as follows:

Judge Directs Government to Respond to New Declaration on Potential Demolition Plans.

Plaintiffs submitted a [supplemental declaration](#) from preservationist and former senior administrator at the General Services Administration's ("GSA") historic buildings portfolio Mydelle Wright indicating that the White House may be bypassing GSA in exploring demolition of *four* federal buildings, raising serious questions about whether similar end-runs are occurring with respect to the EEOB. In a minute order, the Court directed Defendants to file any response to the declaration or supplemental declaration(s) by today, December 10, 2025, ensuring that the issue is formally addressed on the record.

Court Seeks Clarification on Scope of GSA's No-Action Pledge.

While GSA has stated it will not begin physical work on the EEOB until March 1, 2026, that assurance does not address upstream planning steps that could effectively lock in the project. In a minute order, the Court directed Defendants, in their December 10 filing, to indicate whether GSA will also commit not to issue solicitations for a contract, execute a contract, select a contractor, or draft design or construction drawings related to the work before March 1, 2026.

Plaintiffs' Filing Clarifies Why Imminent Irreparable Harm Is Already Occurring.

This afternoon, Plaintiffs [filed a response](#) to the Court's December 8, 2025 minute order (attached) clarifying that their showing of irreparable harm has two interrelated components: (1) the risk of permanent damage to the historic fabric and appearance of the EEOB and the Lafayette Square National Historic Landmark, and (2) the ongoing denial of the National Environmental Protection Act ("NEPA") and the National Historic

Preservation Act (“NHPA”) procedures that Congress enacted to protect those concrete interests as decisions about this project are made. The filing explains that Plaintiffs are not relying on a bare procedural violation; rather, once the government advances planning and potentially commits the project outside NEPA and NHPA, Plaintiffs’ statutory rights to informed review, consultation, and participation for this specific project will be permanently lost—a form of irreparable harm that courts have repeatedly recognized where Congress created procedural rights to safeguard particular environmental and historic resources.

Path Forward: Flexibility if GSA Expands Its Commitments; Preparedness if It Does Not.

Plaintiffs advised the Court that if the GSA adopts the fuller set of commitments the Court invited—agreeing not to issue solicitations, execute contracts, select a contractor, or draft design or construction drawings before March 1, 2026—the case could proceed to the merits of the case in an expedited fashion, with an aim at resolving the case before the March 1, 2026 deadline.

#

Media and Legal Team Contact

Greg Werkheiser, Esq.
Cultural Heritage Partners, PLLC
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1025,
Washington DC, 20006
(703) 408-2002
greg@culturalheritagepartners.com
www.culturalheritagepartners.com