

# **Alert** | Financial Regulatory & Compliance



May 2024

## Supreme Court Holds That CFPB's Funding Is Constitutional, Clearing Way for Rulemaking Agenda

#### Go-To Guide:

- On May 16, 2024, the U.S. Supreme Court held 7-2 that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB)'s funding structure is constitutional.
- The Court's ruling ensures that the CFPB is here to stay and has immediate implications for challenges to CFPB rules and enforcement actions that were paused based on the uncertainty of whether the CFPB's funding is constitutional.

On May 16, 2024, the U.S. Supreme Court held 7-2 in *Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v*. *Community Financial Services Association of America* (CFSA) (Docket No. 22-448) that the CFPB's funding structure is constitutional. With the Court's decision, uncertainty over the CFPB's rulemaking authority tied to the constitutionality of the CFPB's funding has been removed, clearing the way for key rulemaking initiatives to proceed.

At issue in the case was the question of whether the CFPB's funding structure, by which it receives funding directly from the Federal Reserve, violates the U.S. Constitution's Appropriations Clause. In delivering the opinion of the Court, Justice Thomas wrote, "Under the Appropriations Clause, an appropriation is simply a law that authorizes expenditures from a specified source of public money for designated purposes. The statute that provides the Bureau's funding meets these requirements. We therefore conclude that the Bureau's funding mechanism does not violate the Appropriations Clause."



The Court's ruling ensures that the CFPB is here to stay and has immediate implications for challenges to CFPB rules and enforcement actions that were paused based on the uncertainty surrounding whether the CFPB's funding was constitutional following the Fifth Circuit's now-overturned decision in *CFPB v. CFSA*.

For example, beyond the stay of the payday lending rule at issue in *CFPB v. CFSA*, while the case was pending before the Supreme Court, federal courts entered injunctions staying both the CFPB's final rule banning "excessive" consumer credit card late fees and the CFPB's Section 1071 Small Business Lending Rule on the basis that the Supreme Court was reviewing the Fifth Circuit's holding that the CFPB's funding was unconstitutional. Now that the Supreme Court has rejected the Fifth Circuit's holding, the basis for those injunctions is no more, clearing the way for those injunctions to be dissolved. Indeed, in response to the Court's ruling, the CFPB has already announced compliance date extensions for its Small Business Lending Rule.

#### **Takeaways**

With the Supreme Court's decision in *CFPB v. CFSA*, the CFPB has now weathered constitutional challenges to both its leadership structure and its funding structure. With this most recent challenge cleared and reports late last year that the CFPB was planning to substantially increase the size of its staff, the agency may push ahead with its rulemaking and enforcement agendas.

Regulated entities, particularly those that may be subject to rules stayed during the pendency of *CFPB v*. *CFSA*, should pay close attention to CFPB developments moving forward.

### **Authors**

This GT Alert was prepared by:

- Timothy A. Butler | +1 678.553.2326 | Tim.Butler@gtlaw.com
- Matthew M. White | +1 678.553.2111 | Matthew.White@gtlaw.com
- Tessa L. Cierny | +1 678.553.2130 | Tessa.Cierny@gtlaw.com
- Zeba Pirani | Resident Attorney | Atlanta

Albany. Amsterdam. Atlanta. Austin. Berlin.¬ Boston. Charlotte. Chicago. Dallas. Delaware. Denver. Fort Lauderdale. Houston. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.« Las Vegas. London.\* Long Island. Los Angeles. Mexico City.+ Miami. Milan.» Minneapolis. New Jersey. New York. Northern Virginia. Orange County. Orlando. Philadelphia. Phoenix. Portland. Sacramento. Salt Lake City. San Diego. San Francisco. Seoul.∞ Shanghai. Silicon Valley. Singapore. Tallahassee. Tampa. Tel Aviv.^ Tokyo.¤ United Arab Emirates.< Warsaw.~ Washington, D.C.. West Palm Beach. Westchester County.

This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. ¬Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Operates as a separate UK registered legal entity. «Greenberg Traurig operates in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia through Greenberg Traurig Khalid Al-Thebity Law Firm, a professional limited liability company, licensed to practice law by the Ministry of Justice. +Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Maria, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig Singapore LLP which is licensed as a foreign law practice in Singapore. \*Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. \*Greenberg Traurig Singapore Traurig, LLP. \*Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Greenberg Traurig, Sunstand Greenberg Traurig, Sunstand Greenberg Traurig, Sunstand Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Greenberg Traurig, Sunstand Greenberg Traurig, LLP. \*Greenberg Traurig, Sunstand Greenberg Traurig, Sunst