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This week, the Supreme Court will hear Moore v. United States, a case which threatens to deliver a major victory to multinational corporations and billionaires hoping to avoid paying their fair share in taxes. The backdrop for the “billionaire bailout” case is the ongoing Supreme Court corruption crisis, which has continued to grow with more examples of cozy relationships between Supreme Court justices and their billionaire benefactors.

In recent months, countless reports of failures to disclose extravagant gifts, constant influence-peddling in elite circles, and ethical missteps among justices have caused public trust in the Supreme Court to plummet to record lows. There are now too many instances of close relationships between powerful interests who routinely bring business before the Court and justices themselves to ignore. And the same billionaire interests that have maintained these decades-long improper relationships with their justice friends stand to benefit massively from Moore v. US.

One such billionaire who stands to benefit from a favorable ruling in the Moore case is hedge fund magnate Paul Singer. Four companies invested in or acquired by Singer’s hedge fund, Elliott Management, would collectively receive at least $1.74 billion in tax refunds if the Court rules the Mandatory Repatriation Tax unconstitutional in Moore.

Fortunately for Singer, he has friends in high places. In 2008, Singer treated Justice Alito to a private luxury Alaskan fishing retreat on a trip organized by conservative kingpin Leonard Leo. In fact, it was Leo who allegedly arranged for Alito to fly on Singer’s private jet. Alito failed to report this trip — especially problematic given that Alito later heard a case that directly involved Elliott Management’s financial interests.

Now, both Singer and Leo stand to benefit from a case that Justice Alito will hear.

Moore was first taken up by the Supreme Court after five groups that received money from Leonard Leo’s dark money network — the Buckeye Institute, the Manhattan Institute, the Cato Institute, the Pacific Research Institute, and Americans for Tax Reform — filed amicus briefs advocating for the case to be heard.

Recent reports also revealed that the Competitive Enterprise Institute — the right-wing think tank representing the Moores in this lawsuit — is led by executives and board members enmeshed in Leonard Leo’s billionaire-backed dark money network that would benefit from a favorable ruling by the high court. The Competitive Enterprise Institute is also heavily backed by corporate interests that stand to make billions from gutting the repatriation tax.
Just this July, Justice Alito gave multiple inflammatory Wall Street Journal interviews to attorney David Rivkin, who represents the Moores in this case — and is also Leo’s personal lawyer. The interview prompted Senate Judiciary Democrats to call for Alito’s recusal from Moore, but Alito refused.

*Moore v. US* is a chance for billionaire interests to benefit from a favorable ruling delivered by their friends on the high court. The only question that remains is if they’re going to get away with it.

Conflicted Supreme Court justices must recuse themselves from critical cases involving their billionaire friends and close allies. Justice Alito does not exist above the law and has an obvious conflict of interest in the *Moore* case. If he proceeds to hear the case, it will only further erode Americans’ faith in the Supreme Court and the rule of law itself.