

Alert | New York Government Law & Policy



February 2025

New York’s Highest Court Declares Ethics Commission Valid

On Feb. 18, 2025, the New York State Court of Appeals issued a 4-3 decision upholding the constitutionality of the Commission on Ethics and Lobbying in Government (COELIG).¹ As was previously detailed in GT Alerts from [May 2024](#) and [September 2023](#), both the Appellate Division, Third Department and the Albany County Supreme Court criticized COELIG’s structure, ultimately concluding that its establishment and scope of authority violated the separation of powers doctrine. The Court of Appeals, however, disagreed, finding that COELIG’s structure and the manner in which its commissioners are appointed is constitutionally permissible. As a result, COELIG may continue its work consistent with statutory provisions enacted in 2022.

In challenging the Commission’s authority following its attempt to enforce a monetary penalty for violating certain rules prohibiting the use of state resources for private purposes, former-Gov. Andrew Cuomo argued that COELIG, as an ethics enforcement body, exercises executive power and, for that reason, the executive must have sufficient authority to appoint and remove commissioners. Gov. Cuomo argued that the Ethics Commission Reform Act of 2022:

¹ *Cuomo v. COELIG* (2025).

1. “violates constitutional principles of separation of powers because the Commission exercises investigatory and enforcement powers constitutionally entrusted to the Executive, without sufficient oversight by the Governor”;
2. “violates Article V of the State Constitution because, although the Commission is formally within the Department of State, it functions as a separate department without a head appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate”; and
3. “unconstitutionally displaces the . . . impeachment process, by permitting the Commission to sanction the Governor for putative violations of the Public Officers Law.”

The lower courts embraced these arguments, with the Albany County Supreme Court concluding that COELIG was unsalvageable due to it being “a body that exercises executive authority where the Governor’s role is confined only to nominating a minority of that body,” where the body’s vetting and appointment was being conducted by “private operators (like a bunch of deans).”² After the Appellate Division, Third Department upheld the lower court, the state again appealed to the Court of Appeals.

The Court of Appeals focused on three factors to ultimately reverse the lower courts and conclude that the 2022 statutory changes creating COELIG are constitutional: (1) the separation of powers doctrine’s flexibility, (2) COELIG’s appointment and removal powers, and (3) the need to promote the public’s trust in government. The majority of the court stated that the separation of powers doctrine does not need to be applied in a rigid fashion; there may be overlap in duties so long as “core duties and responsibilities are retained” with the executive. The court’s majority similarly stated that the constitution is clear that “powers of appointment and removal . . . generally are divided between the Legislature and the Governor.” The governor is not afforded “indefeasible powers to appoint or remove non-constitutional state officers,” and thus that type of exclusive authority for COELIG does not need to rest with the governor.

Finally, the court reasoned that the legislative justification for the Ethics Commission Reform Act of 2022 was to maintain public confidence in government and that this “implicates fundamental constitutional values.” “Given the danger of self-regulation . . . there is an urgent need for the robust, impartial enforcement of the State’s ethics and lobbying laws.” For these reasons, the court concluded that the Act and the commission’s existence “neither unconstitutionally encroaches upon the Executive nor otherwise deviates from constitutional requirements.”

Promptly after the decision’s release, the Commission’s chair and executive director touted the result, stressing that COELIG has and continues to “administer and enforce the state’s ethics and lobbying laws, deliberately, fairly, and with zeal, pursuing its mission to restore New Yorkers’ faith in state government.” To that end, all regulated parties – including lobbyists, clients of lobbyists, and state government officials -- should expect COELIG to proceed with business as usual.

Authors

This GT Alert was prepared by:

- [Joshua L. Oppenheimer](#) | +1 518.689.1459 | oppenheimerj@gtlaw.com

² *Cuomo v. COELIG*, (Alb. Sup. Ct. 2023)

- **Cathryn O. Crummey** | +1 518.606.5001 | Cat.Crummey@gtlaw.com

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. Munich[–]. New Jersey. New York. Northern Virginia. Orange County. Orlando. Philadelphia. Phoenix. Portland. Sacramento. Salt Lake City. San Diego. San Francisco. São Paulo[»]. 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 and Munich offices are operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, LLP, 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. »Greenberg Traurig's Milan office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Studio Legal Associato, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ›Greenberg Traurig's São Paulo office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Brazil Consultores em Direito Estrangeiro – Direito Estadunidense, incorporated in Brazil as a foreign legal consulting firm. Attorneys in the São Paulo office do not practice Brazilian law. ∞Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ~Greenberg Traurig's Singapore office is operated by 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's Tokyo Office is operated by GT Tokyo Horitsu Jimusho and Greenberg Traurig Gaikokuhojimubengoshi Jimusho, affiliates of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. <Greenberg Traurig's United Arab Emirates office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Limited. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by GREENBERG TRAUURIG Nowakowska-Zimoch Wysockiński sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in GREENBERG TRAUURIG Nowakowska-Zimoch Wysockiński sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2025 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*