

SEC Administrative Law Judge Appointments Held Likely Unconstitutional

September 28, 2015

Defendants in SEC administrative enforcement proceedings have increasingly been going to federal court to challenge the SEC's stepped-up use of its "in-house" tribunal. While the early results were not promising, more recent challenges have gained some traction. In *Hill v. SEC* and *Gray Financial Group, Inc. v. SEC*, a judge from the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia has issued preliminary injunctions halting SEC administrative proceedings, and a Manhattan federal district court judge has issued a comparable ruling in *Duka v. SEC*. The Georgia court held in both actions that the "[enforcement defendants] have proved a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of their claim that the SEC has violated the Appointments Clause [under Article II of the U.S. Constitution]." In reaching this conclusion, the court accepted the enforcement defendants' position that SEC administrative law judges (ALJs) are "inferior officers" (rather than mere employees of the agency) and, as such, must be appointed by either the President alone, the SEC Commissioners, or the federal judiciary, which they are not. The New York court adopted the same rationale. The Georgia court noted that the constitutional defect "could easily be cured by having the SEC Commissioners issue an appointment or preside over the matter themselves." Instead, the SEC has appealed the Georgia and New York district court rulings to the Eleventh Circuit and Second Circuit, respectively. As long as the government continues to litigate the constitutional issue, it is unlikely that the SEC will seek to "cure" the defect through a revised ALJ appointment process. Doing so might be viewed as a government concession that calls into question ALJ appointment procedures in other agencies. Moreover, changes to the appointment process could require new legislation from Congress, could get mired in politics within the SEC, and would have to be reconciled with the already complex bureaucratic procedures associated with ALJ appointments.

Related Practices

[Securities Litigation and Enforcement](#)

©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.