

# A Coming Seismic Shift in Administrative Law? Or Just a Tremor?

February 16, 2023

Article I of the U.S. Constitution articulates the fundamental principles that “[a]ll legislative Powers ... shall be vested in a Congress,” “[t]he executive Power shall be vested in a President,” and “[t]he judicial Power ... shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may ... ordain and establish.” This separation of powers was—and is—a defining feature of the Constitution and, according to the Federalist Papers, meant to be “the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department.”

Nevertheless, the modern administrative state consists of a wide variety of agencies that each wield all three powers—legislative, executive, and judicial—with minimal accountability. For example, the SEC is empowered to promulgate regulations, bring enforcement actions, and conduct administrative hearings to enforce those regulations, having its own administrative law judges to try alleged violations. What’s more, administrative agencies often escape judicial review under the standard laid down by the Supreme Court’s 1984 opinion in *Chevron, U.S.A. v. Natural Resource Defense Council*, which says that “[i]f the statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to the specific issue, the question for the court is whether the agency’s answer is based on a permissible construction of the statute.”

In recent years, however, a movement against the mixing of separate powers into single bodies has begun to snowball. For example, in 2018, Florida amended its constitution to prohibit state judges from deferring to an administrative agency’s interpretation of a state statute or rule. In the 2022 case of *Jarkesy v. SEC*, the Fifth Circuit ruled that the SEC’s in-house adjudication of an alleged violation of securities laws violated the Seventh Amendment, that Congress unconstitutionally delegated legislative power to the SEC, and that restrictions on the removal of the SEC’s administrative law judges violated Article II of the U.S. Constitution.

Currently, the constitutionality of FINRA is being challenged in *Scottsdale Capital Advisors Corp. v. FINRA*. There, the plaintiffs allege that FINRA improperly exercises executive power, FINRA's structure violates the "appointments" clause of the Constitution, and Congress improperly delegated legislative powers to FINRA. It remains to be seen whether this lawsuit against FINRA will follow *Jarkesy* and whether the burgeoning trend against the comingling of separate governmental powers in a single agency will become an avalanche. What is certain is that the spate of recent lawsuits challenging the SEC's and FINRA's constitutionality signals an unstable status quo for administrative law.

## Authored By



Natalie A. Napierala



David R. Wright

## Related Practices

[FINRA Enforcement, Arbitration, and Appeals](#)  
[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Solutions](#)  
[Securities Litigation and Enforcement](#)  
[Financial Services Regulatory](#)

## Related Industries

[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Solutions](#)  
[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Solutions](#)  
[Securities & Investment Companies](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site

may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.