

APL 2024-0076
Albany County Index #903759-23
Appellate Division, Third Dept. #CV-23-1778

NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

ANDREW M. CUOMO,

Respondent,

-against-

NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION ON ETHICS
AND LOBBYING IN GOVERNMENT,

Appellant.

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF TO PREVENT FRAUD ON THE COURT

Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
by Elena Ruth Sassower, Director,
acting on her own behalf, on CJA's behalf, &
on behalf of the People of the State of New York
& the Public Interest

10 Stewart Place, Apartment 2D-E
White Plains, New York 10603
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

December 16, 2024

20th Anniversary/*Pataki v. Assembly/Silver v. Pataki*, 4 NY3d 75
80th Anniversary/Battle of the Bulge (Ardennes, Belgium)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities

Identity and Interest of the *Amicus Curiae*.....1

Amicus Curiae Brief to Prevent Fraud on the Court.....2

I. The “ethics commission reform act of 2022”
is NOT “a duly enacted statute” –
& this Moots Whether It is Constitutional, *As Written*,
Absent Invocation of Exceptions to Mootness2

II. The Briefs of the Parties & *Amici* Before this Court.....11

III. “The Final Nails in COELIG’s Coffin”.....14

Table of Exhibits15

Certificate of Compliance with Court Rule 500.13(c)(1)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

[New York State Constitution, Article III, §1](#)

[New York State Constitution, Article VII, §§1-7](#)

STATUTES

[CPLR §2214\(c\)](#)

[Executive Law §94](#)

[“ethics commission reform act of 2022” – Part QQ of Education, Labor, Housing, and Family Assistance Budget Bill #S.8006-C/A.9006-C \(at pp. 151-201\)](#)

CASE LAW

[*Center for Jud. Accountability, Inc. v Cuomo, et al.*, 167 AD3d 1406](#), (3d Dept 2018), appeals by right and by leave *dismissed/denied* and all other relief: [33 NY3d 993](#) (2019), [34 NY3d 960](#) (2019), [34 NY3d 961](#) (2019), [34 NY3d 961](#) (2019), [34 NY3d 1147](#) (2020)

[*Delgado v State of New York*, 194 AD3d 98](#) (3d Dept 2021), *affd* 39 NY3d 242 (2022)

[*I.L.F.Y. Co. v. Temporary State Hous. Rent Commn.*](#), 10 N.Y.2d 263, 269 (1961)

[*Lincoln Bldg. Assoc. v. Barr*](#), 1 N.Y.2d 413, 415 (1956)

[*New York State Bankers Association, Inc. et al. v. Wetzler*](#), 81 NY2d 98, 102 (1993)

[*Pataki v. Assembly/Silver v. Pataki*](#), 4 N.Y.3d 75 (2004)

[*White v. Cuomo*](#), 38 N.Y.3d 209, 217 (N.Y. 2022)

Identity and Interest of the *Amicus Curiae*

Amicus Curiae Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) is a non-partisan, non-profit citizens’ organization with two inter-related appeals of right presently before the Court – one of which, *CJA, et al. v. JCOPE, et al.* (APL 2024-00150), moots *Cuomo v. COELIG* by its sixth and seventh causes of action and exposes the fraud perpetrated by COELIG, Cuomo, the “good government”/New York City Bar Association *amici*, and by the Appellate Division, Third Department’s May 9, 2024 Opinion and Order, the subject of the *Cuomo v. COELIG* appeal.

As demonstrated by this *amicus curiae* brief,¹ the “ethics commission reform act of 2022” is unconstitutional, *by its enactment* – and this Court’s duty, on appeal, is to so-elaborate, including by revisiting “*Pataki v New York State Assembly*, 4 NY3d 75, 83 [2004]”.

¹ This *amicus curiae* brief, in pdf format with its live hyperlinks, is accessible from CJA’s webpage for *Cuomo v. COELIG* at the Court of Appeals – www.judgewatch.org/web-pages/lawsuit-jcope-et-al/ct-of-appeals-cuomo-v-coelig.htm.

Amicus Curiae Brief to Prevent Fraud on the Court

I.

The “ethics commission reform act of 2022” is NOT “a duly enacted statute” – & this Moots Whether It is Constitutional, As Written, Absent Invocation of Exceptions to Mootness

The Appellate Division’s flimsy, superficial [May 9, 2024 Opinion and Order](#), which cannot be deemed an adequate appellate opinion of a single judge, let alone five, is constructed to conceal every aspect of the enactment of what it refers to only as Executive Law §94, other than, as would be consistent with separation of powers, and [Article III, §1 of the New York State Constitution](#), that its enactment was by “the Legislature”:

At ¶2

“...in 2022 the Legislature enacted a new version of Executive Law §94 in response to the alleged failings of JCOPE in general. This amounted to a sweeping overhaul to the policy of ethics violations by government officials and created defendant as a replacement for JCOPE. ...” (underlining added).

At ¶4

“We affirm. ‘Legislative enactments enjoy a strong presumption of constitutionality and parties challenging **a duly enacted statute** face the initial burden of demonstrating the statute’s invalidity beyond a reasonable doubt’ ([Delgado v State of New York, 194 AD3d 98](#), 103 [3d Dept 2021] [internal quotation marks and citations omitted], *affd* 39 NY3d 242 [2022]; *see Center for Jud. Accountability, Inc. v Cuomo, 167 AD3d 1406*, 1409 [3d Dept 2018], *appeal dismissed* 33 NY3d 993 [2019], *lv dismissed & denied* 34 NY3d 961 [2019]). Legislative power in New York is vested in the Senate and Assembly (*see* NY Const, art III, §1), whereas executive power is vested in the governor (*see* NY

Const, art IV, §1). Among other powers, the governor ‘shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed’ (NY Const, art IV, §3), which ‘include[s] the power to enforce and implement legislative enactments’ (*Under 21, Catholic Home Bur. for Dependent Children v City of New York*, 65 NY2d 344, 356 [1985]). Thus, separation of powers is ‘implied by the separate grants of power to each of the coordinate branches of government’ (*Bourquin v Cuomo*, 85 NY2d 781, 784 [1995] [internal quotation marks and citation omitted]).” (underlining, bold, and hyperlinking added).²

¶¶6, 7, 8, and 9 are exclusively devoted to reciting provisions of Executive Law §94, following which the Appellate Division’s Opinion and Order states, in its ¶10:

“We find that by enacting the foregoing scheme for the enforcement of the applicable ethics laws, the Legislature, though well intentioned in its actions, violated the bedrock principles of separation of powers. Despite defendant’s assertion to the contrary, this Court may not utilize the Legislature’s motive or the beneficial purposes of this legislation to overlook this violation. Even the most advantageous legislation violates the dictates of separation of powers if it results in one branch of government encroaching upon the powers of another for the purpose of expanding its own powers....” (bold and hyperlinking added).

² In citing to its own decisions in [Delgado v NYS](#) and [CJA v. Cuomo](#) for the proposition that a “duly enacted statute” carries an “exceedingly strong presumption of constitutionality”, the Appellate Division was substituting the citation COELIG had furnished in its brief (at p. 18), which was to this Court’s decision in [White v. Cuomo](#), 38 N.Y.3d 209 (N.Y. 2022).

In *White v. Cuomo*, the Court identified (at 217) that in tandem with the “exceedingly strong presumption of constitutionality” is:

“a ‘presumption that the [l]egislature has investigated for and found facts necessary to support the legislation’ ([I.L.F.Y. Co. v. Temporary State Hous. Rent Commn.](#), 10 N.Y.2d 263, 269...[1961]; see [Lincoln Bldg. Assoc. v. Barr](#), 1 N.Y.2d 413, 415...[1956]).” (hyperlinking added).

Yet, as apparent from the Court’s decision in *Lincoln Bldg. Assoc. v. Barr*, these two presumptions are the same, or at least substantially so:

“A legislative enactment carries with it a strong presumption of constitutionality, i.e., it is presumed to be supported by facts known to the Legislature... This presumption, however, is not irrebuttable...”

Not revealed by the first ten paragraphs of the Appellate Division’s Opinion and Order or by its remaining three is that the statute replacing JCOPE with COELIG – the “ethics commission reform act of 2022” [ECRA], [Part QQ of Education, Labor, Housing, and Family Assistance Budget Bill #S.8006-C/A.9006-C](#) (at pp. 151-201) – is **NOT** “a duly enacted statute” and that the evidence of this was furnished to the Appellate Division and to the attorneys for the *Cuomo v. COELIG* parties and *amici* by CJA’s January 12, 2024 motion in [Cuomo v. COELIG \(CV-23-1778\)](#), requesting that the appeal in [CJA, et al. v. JCOPE, et al. \(CV-23-0115\)](#) be heard together with it, and, if denied, that CJA’s moving affidavit, with its four exhibits, be deemed an *amicus* submission to prevent fraud ([Exhibit 1](#)).³

[CJA’s January 12, 2024 moving affidavit](#) demonstrated, by hyperlinks to the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* [brief](#), [reply brief](#), and record on appeal, CJA’s open-and-shut entitlement to summary judgment on ALL ten causes of action of its [June 6, 2022 verified petition](#), beginning with the sixth:

“Declaring Unconstitutional, Unlawful, and Void Part QQ of Education, Labor, Housing, and Family Assistance Budget Bill #S.8006-C/A.9006.C – the ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’ – Enacted in

³ Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 herein, constituting the record of CJA’s January 12, 2024 motion in *Cuomo v. COELIG*, have been downloaded from the Appellate Division’s [NYSCEF docket for Cuomo v. COELIG CV-23-1778](#), where the Appellate Division Clerk’s Office posted them behind the Appellate Division’s February 1, 2024 “Decision and Order on Motion” denying the motion ([#31](#)), after initially not posting them, at all and then, upon CJA’s protest, posting them as [#32](#) and [#33](#), which it then deleted, upon shuffling them behind the February 1, 2024 “Decision and Order on Motion” with the notation: “*Corrected* Pro Se motion (bookmarked) with exhibits”. These same documents, being part of CJA’s corresponding January 12, 2024 motion in [CJA v. JCOPE, et al. CV-23-0115](#), were there posted, as filed, by CJA, as a party, as [#28](#), [#29](#), [#30](#), [#31](#), [#32](#), [#33](#), [#35](#), [#36](#), [#37](#), and [#38](#).

Violation of Mandatory Provisions of the New York State Constitution, Statutes, Legislative Rules, and Caselaw”.

It described (at ¶8) the sixth cause of action – and the seventh cause of action for identical declarations with respect to the whole of the FY2022-23 state budget – as

“involv[ing] a multitude of ‘separation of powers issue[s]’ pertaining to the duties of, and limitations on, the Governor and Legislature in fashioning and enacting the state budget, prescribed by [Article VII of the New York State Constitution](#), ALL eviscerated by their collusion with each other – and with the Judiciary – so-alleged by those two causes of action...”

The *Cuomo v. COELIG* parties and *amici* did not dispute this – nor the further particulars of CJA’s moving affidavit as to the fraud they were committing before the Appellate Division by their *Cuomo v. COELIG* briefs, each concealing their knowledge that ECRA was unconstitutionally enacted *via* the budget and by fraud – with the briefs of COELIG and the *amici* additionally fraudulent by their assertions as to ECRA’s salutary purpose and its purported rectification of JCOPE’s supposed deficiencies, and of COELIG’s superiority, including because of its “independent review committee” of New York’s 15 law school deans.

[CJA’s January 22, 2024 reply affirmation](#) in further support of the motion ([Exhibit 2](#)) highlighted that the motion was unopposed and furnished, as exhibits decisive of CJA’s entitlement to summary judgment on its sixth and seventh causes of action, two documents from the record:

- [CJA’s March 18, 2020 letter to then Governor Cuomo](#), Exhibit A-5 to CJA’s June 6, 2022 verified petition, entitled: “[Your January 21, 2020 address on the Executive Budget – Part III: GOOD NEWS DURING THIS CORONAVIRUS EMERGENCY – You Can Chuck Six of Your Seven ‘Article VII Bills’ Because They are Unconstitutional](#)”. Here’s why based on the Court of Appeals’ 2004 plurality, concurring, and dissenting opinions in *Pataki v. Assembly/Silver v. Pataki*, 4 N.Y.3d 75”;
- [CJA’s June 28, 2022 “CPLR §2214\(c\) NOTICE of Papers to be Furnished to the Court”](#), whose concluding paragraph read:

“PLEASE ADDITIONALLY TAKE NOTICE that your failure to make such production will entitle petitioners [to] the granting of the relief sought by their June 23, 2022 notice of petition, starting [with] the requested TRO, preliminary injunction, and declaration that Part QQ of Education, Labor, Housing, and Family Assistance Budget Bill S.8006-C/A.9006-C – the ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’ – is unconstitutional, unlawful, and void as it was enacted in violation of mandatory provisions of the New York State Constitution, statutes, legislative rules, and caselaw.^{fn4}”

Nevertheless, by a [February 1, 2024 “Decision and Order on Motion”](#), the Appellate Division denied CJA’s unopposed January 12, 2024 motion, without decision, facts or law – and did the same by another [February 1, 2024 “Decision and Order on Motion”](#), this in *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.*, where CJA’s companion January 12, 2024 motion was also unopposed.

^{fn4} See, *inter alia*, [New York State Bankers Association, Inc. et al. v. Wetzler, as Commissioner of the Department of Taxation and Finance of the State of New York](#), 81 NY2d 98, 102 (1993) ‘The question concerns not what was enacted or its effect on the budgetary process, but whether there was authority to enact the provision at all. Our precedents clearly compel the conclusion that the controversy is justiciable...’”

Tellingly, the Appellate Division’s [May 9, 2024 Opinion and Order](#) does NOT purport that ECRA—which it identifies only as Executive Law §94⁴—was “duly enacted”. Instead, it omits everything about how it was enacted, *via* the budget⁵—not even mentioning the budget, including at the very end of the Opinion and Order, where, by its footnote 2, it states:

“Supreme Court... did not overlook that ‘the classic separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches is modified to some degree by our [state] Constitution’ (*Pataki v New York State Assembly*, 4 NY3d 75, 83 [2004] [internal quotation marks omitted])”.

In so-quoting the Court’s 2004 decision in [Pataki v. Assembly](#), the Appellate Division removes its reference to the budget—the Court having there stated (at p. 83):

“Article VII, §§1-7 now govern the budget process. Several of these provisions vest certain legislative powers in the Governor, creating a limited exception to the rule stated in article III, §1 of the Constitution: ‘The legislative power of this state shall be vested in the senate and assembly.’ Thus, the classic ‘separation of powers’ between the

⁴ [Executive Law §94](#) was what ECRA enacted and does NOT include §§1 and 2 of [Part QQ of Education, Labor, Housing, and Family Assistance Budget Bill #S.8006-C/A.9006-C](#) (at pp. 151-201), which read:

“Section 1. This act shall be known and may be cited as the ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’.

§2. Section 94 of the executive law is REPEALED and a new section 94 is added to read as follows:” (capitalization in the original).

The text after the “as follows” is “§94. Commission on ethics and lobbying in government. ...”

⁵ By contrast, the Appellate Division’s cited-to [Delgado v NYS](#) decision refers to the statute there at issue as “**a budget bill**...L 2018, ch 59, §1, part HHH”, albeit not identifying the bill: [Revenue Budget Bill S.7509-C/A.9509-C, Part HHH](#) (pp. 156-158)]. Its cited-to [CJA v. Cuomo](#) decision refers to the statute there at issue as “**a supplemental budget bill**...2015 NY Senate-Assembly Bill S4610-A, A6721-A” (at pp. 558-9). [[Part E of S.4610/A.6721](#) (pp. 92-94)].

executive and legislative branches is modified to some degree by our Constitution...”.

It is precisely as to “[Article VII, §§1-7](#)...govern[ing] the budget process” that the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* sixth and seventh causes of action establish ECRA’s unconstitutionality *by its enactment*. This renders academic and moots the *Cuomo v. COELIG* constitutional challenge to ECRA, *as written*, absent invocation of exceptions to mootness – and so-asserted by [CJA’s January 12, 2024 moving affidavit](#) (¶14), without contest from anyone, and by its [January 22, 2024 reply affirmation](#) (¶¶6, 8).

As stated by the sixth cause of action (at ¶82) and quoted by CJA’s [June 28, 2022 CPLR §2214\(c\) NOTICE](#) (as #1), the “starting point for the declaration that Part QQ [of Education, Labor, Housing and Family Assistance Budget Bill #S.8006-C/A.9006-C – the ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’] was unconstitutionally enacted” is [CJA’s March 18, 2020 letter to Governor Cuomo](#). It particularizes how separation of powers has been replaced by collusion of powers by the Governor and Legislature, fraudulently employing “non-appropriation” misnomered “Article VII bills” as a vehicle for packing the budget with non-tax, non-revenue-producing policy legislation. In substantiation, it furnishes (at pp. 5-7, 10-13), a devastating analysis of the Court’s 2004 plurality, concurring, and dissenting opinions in [Pataki v. Assembly/Silver v. Pataki, 4 N.Y.3d 75](#), seemingly the ONLY analysis to date, a full

20 years later. The analysis starts (at p. 5) with the above-quoted “Article VII, §§1-7 now govern the budget process...”.

As for the Appellate Division’s crediting of the Legislature’s motives as “well intentioned” and the “legislation” as “beneficial” in its above-quoted ¶10 of its Opinion and Order, this is fraud. As stated by [CJA’s January 12, 2024 moving affidavit](#) (at ¶15),

“the ‘motives’ behind ECRA are directly challenged by the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* verified petition, expressly asserting that its motive was to insulate complained-against public officers from accountability by removing key provisions of the JCOPE statute, stripping complainants of rights available through mandamus (¶¶6(a)(b)(c), 17, 80), and stripping the Inspector General of jurisdiction” (underlining in the original),⁶

thereupon noting that COELIG’s own description of ECRA as “carefully tailored to remedy JCOPE’s perceived flaws” hedged that these, in fact, were JCOPE’s actual problems because they were NOT and that:

“the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* verified petition expressly asserts that JCOPE’s actual problem was not a deficiency in its statute, but in its enforcement (¶¶5, 100) – and that the Senate Ethics Committee’s two hearings in 2021 were rigged to prevent an evidentiary presentation on the subject (¶104, & its Exhibits [L-1](#), [L-2](#), [L-3](#), [L-4](#), [L-5](#), [L-6](#)) and, on top of this, that:

‘[the Committee’s [December 17, 2021 report](#) on the first hearing, thus far its only report, omitted petitioners’ written statement in support of testimony ([Exhibit L-1](#)) and written

⁶ The cited to “¶¶6... (c), 17, 80” identify and/or quote [CJA’s April 13, 2022 complaint to JCOPE against the Governor and Legislature](#), Exhibit A-1 to the June 6, 2022 verified petition, on which its sixth and seventh causes of action principally rest. The complaint is based on their ulterior motives and self-interest in enacting ECRA to insulate themselves from complaints arising from their corrupting of state governance to benefit themselves, including by “false instrument” pay raises.

testimony ([Exhibit L-2](#)), because, as evident therefrom, they were dispositive and devastating.” (hyperlinking in the original).

Indeed, [CJA’s January 12, 2024 moving affidavit](#) resoundingly demonstrated that ECRA, *as applied*, was NOT remotely beneficial by furnishing the Appellate Division with “primary-source, documentary evidence” establishing that ECRA’s purportedly salutary provisions were completely worthless and that COELIG, enabled by the “independent review committee” of New York’s 15 law school deans, was more corrupt than JCOPE. This evidence, summarized by the moving affidavit, was embodied in its four exhibits:

[Exhibit A](#): CJA’s first complaint to COELIG on its DAY 1, July 8, 2022, explicitly TESTING its functioning by resubmitting to it CJA’s seven complaints to JCOPE, plus a new complaint against Attorney General Letitia James for her conflict-of-interest-driven litigation fraud in [CJA v. JCOPE, et al. \(Albany Supreme Court #904235-22\)](#)

[Exhibit B](#): CJA’s October 6, 2022 supplement to the July 8, 2022 complaint as to AG James’ continued conflict-of-interest-driven litigation fraud in *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.*;

[Exhibit C](#): CJA’s March 29, 2023 testimony at COELIG’s first annual hearing, furnishing an overview of COELIG’s performance in its first nine months and its enablers: the “independent review committee” of New York’s 15 law school deans;

[Exhibit D](#): CJA’s October 2, 2023 complaint “against COELIG’s Commissioners, Executive Director, General Counsel, & Other High-Ranking Staff”, plus resubmission of CJA’s July 8, 2022 complaint and October 6, 2022 supplement.

II The Briefs of the Parties & *Amici* Before this Court

The briefs that Appellant COELIG, its allied *amici*, and Respondent Cuomo have filed with this Court ALL replicate, essentially *verbatim*, the briefs they filed at the Appellate Division, whose frauds and deceptions [CJA's January 12, 2024 moving affidavit](#) already exposed. Thus,

- before this Court, [COELIG's August 14, 2024 brief](#) (at pp. 1, 3, 5-9, 19) replicates its [November 27, 2023 brief](#) (at pp. 1, 4-8, 18), notwithstanding CJA's January 12, 2024 moving affidavit (at ¶15) demonstrated its fraud and deceit;
- before this Court, [the amici's August 23, 2024 brief](#) (at pp. 1-15) replicates its [December 15, 2023 brief](#) (at pp. 1-14), notwithstanding CJA's January 12, 2024 moving affidavit (at ¶¶16-32) demonstrated its fraud and deceit;
- before this Court, [Cuomo's October 30, 2024 brief](#) (at pp. 6-7) replicates his [December 27, 2023 brief](#) (at pp. 5-6), notwithstanding CJA's January 12, 2024 moving affidavit (at ¶¶33-40) demonstrated the fraud and deceit of Cuomo's:

“great concern with constitutional separation of powers, while concealing the constitutional separation of powers violations pertaining to the state budget by omitting that that is how the ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’ was enacted”.

Consequently, CJA's January 12, 2024 moving affidavit rebuts the corresponding portions of these briefs before the Court. Indeed, the only further rebuttal needed is as to the replicated falsehoods and inferences as to COELIG's success and superiority to JCOPE in [COELIG's August 14, 2024 brief](#) and [November](#)

[15, 2024 reply brief](#) – when, as COELIG knows and its attorney AG James knows, COELIG’s corruption has been unabated.

This unabated corruption, involving further complaints to COELIG subsequent to the October 2, 2023 complaint, is summarized by [CJA’s November 13, 2024 testimony before COELIG at its annual hearing](#), and was, itself, a [second complaint “against COELIG’s Commissioners, Executive Director, General Counsel, & Other High-Ranking Staff”](#). It is annexed hereto as [Exhibit 3](#).

As with [CJA’s October 2, 2023 first complaint “against COELIG’s Commissioners, Executive Director, General Counsel, & Other High-Ranking Staff”](#), which furnished a devastating analysis of COELIG’s Annual Report for 2022, so CJA’s November 13, 2024 second complaint against them provides a devastating expose of COELIG’s Annual Report for 2023 – as to which, [on November 15, 2024, CJA made a supplemental submission, by four FOIL requests](#). It is annexed hereto as [Exhibit 4](#).

Finally, as an update to [CJA’s first June 12, 2022 letter to the “independent review committee” of 15 law school deans](#) and CJA’s subsequent two August 4, 2024 letters ([#1](#), [#2](#)), featured by [CJA’s January 12, 2024 moving affidavit](#) (at ¶¶21, 25-28) in its expose of the fraud of the “good government”/New York City Bar *amici*, annexed hereto, as [Exhibit 5](#), is [CJA’s August 6, 2024 letter to the seven new law school dean members of the “independent review committee”](#) entitled:

“Have Your Predecessor Law School Deans & the IRC’s Other Law School Deans Apprised You of What Has Been Going On? – & IRC’s Ethical, Professional, and Civic Responsibilities Going Forward...”

The cc’s on the letter, to whom it was [e-mailed](#), were the seven predecessor law school deans and the IRC’s eight original and current law school deans – and the only response from the IRC was the same as it had been to the predecessor correspondence, to ignore it and flagrantly violate ECRA’s Executive Law §94.3, starting with subsection (j),⁷ with respect to the proposed COELIG nominee that it approved ten days later, on August 16, 2024 – and the two subsequent proposed renominations of COELIG members, which it approved on September 6, 2024 and November 8, 2024.

⁷ ECRA’s Executive Law §94.3(j) reads:

“Upon the receipt of the selection members’ appointments, members of the independent review committee shall disclose to the independent review committee any personal, professional, financial, or other direct or indirect relationships a member of the independent review committee may have with an appointee. If the independent review committee determines a conflict of interest exists, such independent review committee member shall, in writing, notify the other members of the independent review committee of the possible conflict. The member may recuse themselves from all subsequent involvement in the consideration of and action upon the appointment. If, after disclosure, the member does not recuse themselves from the matter, the independent review committee, by majority vote finding the disclosed information creates a substantial conflict of interest, may remove the conflicted member from further consideration of and action upon the appointment.”

III “The Final Nails in COELIG’s Coffin”

CJA’s culminating November 13, 2024 complaint to and against COELIG ([Exhibit 3](#), [Exhibit 4](#)), CJA’s correspondence with the IRC law school deans ([here](#)), and CJA’s “comment” to COELIG’s “selection members”, *to wit*, Governor Hochul, the Senate and Assembly Majority and Minority Leaders, Attorney General James, and Comptroller DiNapoli, with respect to their “proposed nominees” to COELIG ([here](#)) are all “final nails in COELIG’s coffin”, proving, resoundingly, that apart from ECRA being unconstitutional, *by its enactment*, through the budget and by fraud, it is a herculean hoax and unconstitutional, *as applied*.

As stated by the ninth cause of action of the [CJA v. JCOPE, et al. June 6, 2022 verified complaint](#):

“103. It is unconstitutional – and a larceny of taxpayer monies – for taxpayers to fund ethics entities which are not doing the job for which they are paid – and which these entities conceal by false pretenses...” (at p. 44).

s/

Elena Ruth Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA),
acting on her own behalf, on CJA’s behalf,
& on behalf of the People of the State of New York & the Public Interest

December 16, 2024

20th Anniversary/*Pataki v. Assembly/Silver v. Pataki*, 4 NY3d 75
80th Anniversary/Battle of the Bulge (Ardennes, Belgium)

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

- [Exhibit 1:](#) CJA’s January 12, 2024 notice of motion, moving affidavit, and its four exhibits in *Cuomo v. COELIG*
- [Exhibit 2:](#) CJA’s January 22, 2024 reply affirmation in further support of the motion, and its three exhibits
- [Exhibit 3:](#) CJA’s November 13, 2024 testimony/complaint “against COELIG’s Commissioners, Executive Director, General Counsel, & Other High-Ranking Staff”, with CJA’s March 29, 2023 testimony
- [Exhibit 4:](#) CJA’s November 15, 2024 supplement to its November 13, 2024 testimony and complaint by four FOIL requests
- [Exhibit 5:](#) CJA’s August 8, 2024 letter to the seven new law school deans of the “independent review committee”, *cc*’ing their predecessor law school deans and the IRC’s other eight law school deans

Certificate of Compliance with Court Rule 500.13(c)(1)

Pursuant to this Court's Rule 500.13(c)(1), I certify that the word count for this *Amicus Curiae* Brief, according to the computer used to prepare it, is 3,881 words, which includes everything from its first page to its last.



Elena Ruth Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA),
acting on her own behalf, on CJA's behalf,
& on behalf of the People of the State of New York & the Public Interest

Dated: White Plains, New York
December 16, 2024