

From: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2026 4:36 PM
To: FOIL; elena@judgewatch.org

Subject: RE: FOIL/Records Request: The Judiciary's FY2026-27 Budget Submission

This e-mail partially responds to your correspondence dated 1/26/26 which pursuant to FOIL, requested:

The Judiciary's FY 2026-27 budget submission bears your name on its cover and its first page is your two-sentence December 1, 2025 transmitting memorandum. Pursuant to Public Officers Law Article VI ("Freedom of Information Law") and Part 124 of the Rules of the Chief Administrative Judge ("Public Access to Records"), this is to request:

(1) records reflecting which are "the attached schedules", referred to by the November 20, 2025 "Chief Judge's Certification" as constituting "the itemized estimates of the financial needs of the Judiciary for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 2026...approved by the Court of Appeals".

(2) records reflecting which are the "attached itemized estimates", referred to by the November 20, 2025 "Court of Appeals Approval".

(3) records defining the terms "State Operating Cash Estimate" and "All Funds Cash Estimate", appearing in the first two paragraphs of the "Introduction" – and why the dollar amount of the "All Funds Cash Estimate" and its percentage increase is NOT furnished, as it is for the "State Operating Cash Estimate", to wit, "The FY 2027 State Operating Cash Estimate of \$3.2 billion reflects an increase of \$199 million (6.7%) over FY 2026" (1st page of "Introduction", 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence).

(4) any narrative explanation of the two charts entitled "Judiciary All Funds Disbursement Requirements (In Millions)" and "Judiciary All Funds Appropriation Requirements", and, specifically, why two charts are needed, the definition of "FY

2026 Available” from which the dollar amounts of the “Change” is calculated, and why neither chart identifies “Reappropriations”.

(5) records as to why the Judiciary’s 17-page “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – so identified by the “Table of Contents” – is only titled “The Judiciary” – and why it

begins at §2 and then continues, ten pages later, with §3 for “Reappropriations”.

(6) records explaining/interpreting the two introductory “Notwithstanding” provisions on page 1 of the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – and:

(i) pertaining to the first, records as to the amount of monies “transferred to the attorney licensing fund” from “the state treasury pursuant to subdivision 1 of section 465 of the judiciary law” in the FY2025-26 fiscal year based on the identical provision in the Judiciary’s FY2025-26 Bill, and,

(ii) pertaining to the second, records as to the number of “contracts with the center for justice innovation”, approved by you and filed with the comptroller and their amounts, pursuant to the identical corresponding provision in the Judiciary’s FY2025-26 Bill.

(7) records germane to the “Notwithstanding” provision on page 1 of the Bill under the heading “State Operations 2026-27”, to wit, your approval of increases and decreases by interchange in FY2025-26, pursuant to the identical provision in the Judiciary’s FY2025-26 Bill, and, specifically, how many and what they were.

(8) records establishing why the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” (at pp. 1, 10-17) includes “Reappropriations”, when such are NOT mentioned anywhere else in the Judiciary’s budget submission, to wit, (i) its five-page “Introduction”, (ii) its two charts; (iii) its three-part “FY 2027 Judiciary Budget Request” section which includes “Aid to Localities” and “Capital Projects”; and (iv) its “General State Charges” section.

(9) records showing that the “Reappropriations” (at pp. 1, 10-17) meet the definition of what is

suitable for reappropriation, such as the Division of the Budget identifies in its “Citizen’s Guide”/“Financial Terminology” – apart from the first entry under “Aid to Localities Reappropriations 2026-27” (at p. 14) and the entries under “Capital Project Reappropriations 2026-27” (at pp. 15-16).

(10) records as to what is the total dollar amount of the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – and why that amount is NOT identified on the Bill’s first page – or thereafter.

(11) records as to what is the total dollar amount of the “Appropriations” requested by the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – and why that amount is NOT identified on the Bill’s first page – or thereafter.

(12) records as to what is the total dollar amount of the “Reappropriations” requested by the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – and why that amount is NOT identified on the Bill’s first page – or thereafter.

(13) records reflecting the dollar amount requested by the Judiciary’s FY2026-27 budget submission for what it identifies in its “Introduction” under the heading “Core Operations Funding Summary” (at p. ii) as:

“A salary increase of 2% for all judges and justices, as authorized by the New York State Commission on Legislative, Judicial and Executive Compensation in 2023” (underlining added) –

then transmogrified in the budget’s section on “Courts of Original Jurisdiction” as “Funding is also included for a 2% judicial salary increase, as required by law” (at p. 4) and repeated as “a 2% judicial salary increase, as required by law” (at pp. 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 29) and, likewise, in its sections on the “Court of Appeals” (at p. 56) and “Appellate Court Operations” (at p. 59) as “a 2% judicial salary increase, as required by law (underlining added).

(14) records reflecting why the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” contains no line item for the dollar amount of the “salary increase of 2% for all judges and justices, as authorized by the New York State Commission on Legislative, Judicial and Executive Compensation in 2023”.

(15) records as to why the Judiciary’s FY26-27 budget submission for its “Attorney Discipline Program” – part of “Appellate Auxiliary Operations” (at pp. 84-85) – seeks \$17,392,000, with an accompanying text stating that this is “an increase of \$0.1 million (0.6%) over the current year adjusted appropriation” – without revealing that the Judiciary’s FY25-26 budget request of \$17,287,000 for the “Attorney Discipline Program (at pp. 81-82) was \$486,853 LESS than its FY24-25 request of \$17,773,853 (at pp. 107-109), in other words, the current request is \$381,853 LESS than the request of two years ago.

(16) records as to why, in contrast to the Judiciary’s prior budget submissions which had identified the “Office of the Inspector General” as part of its “Court Support Services Program” of its “Courts of Original Jurisdiction” and specified the appropriation for it,⁵ the comparable section of the FY26-27 budget submission (at pp. 39-42), identically to its FY25-26 budget submission (at pp. 39-42), omits the Office of the Inspector General whose jurisdiction includes non-judicial personnel – and a search of the FY26-27 budget submission brings up ZERO results.

(17) records reflecting the Judiciary’s intended FY26-27 appropriation for the Office of the Inspector General – and what the appropriation was for FY25-26.

(18) records reflecting what actions you took in response to CJA’s October 25, 2023 complaint to you against “Judges, Government-Attorneys, & Government-Retained Attorneys Arising from a Fraudulent, Culturally-Biased Child Abuse/Neglect Petition against Innocent Parents” to ensure its proper handling by those within your supervisory purview, to wit, the Appellate Division Attorney Grievance Committees, the Inspector General, and Statewide Coordinating Judge for Family Court Matters Richard Rivera – and by the Commission on Judicial Conduct – germane to the “Introduction” of the Judiciary’s FY2026-27 budget submission identifying (at p. ii) “Additional funding for Attorney for Child (AFC) providers for critical representation services for children involved in Family Court proceedings (\$4.2 million) – and the budget request of \$216,851,000 (at

pp. 73-76) for the “Attorney for the Child Program” that is part of its “Appellate Auxiliary Operations”.

With regards to Items (1) through (5), (7) – (17), to the extent that your request is reasonably described, the Office of Court Administration has conducted a diligent search of available records and has not located any records responsive to your request.

Please be advised that this correspondence is a partial response. We are finalizing our response for Items (6) and (18) of your request and anticipate a final response for Items (6) and (18) to be issued on or before May 15, 2026.

Pursuant to Public Officers Law § 89(4)(a), you have thirty (30) days to take a written appeal of this determination. You may appeal by writing:

Michael Siudzinski, Assistant Deputy Counsel

FOIL Appeals Officer

25 Beaver Street, 10th Floor

New York, NY 10004

Or you may submit such appeal by email to: FOILappeal@nycourts.gov

Sincerely,

FOIL Officer

Office of Court Administration

Agency Building 4 ESP, Suite 2001

Albany, NY 12223



From: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>

Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2026 4:39 PM

To: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>; elena@judgewatch.org

Subject: RE: FOIL/Records Request: The Judiciary's FY2026-27 Budget Submission

Please be advised that we require additional time to complete our response to your FOIL request dated 1/26/26. We will provide you with a response on or before April 23, 2026. We anticipate this to be our final extension for this request.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter.

Sincerely,

FOIL Officer
Office of Court Administration
Agency Building 4 ESP, Suite 2001
Albany, NY 12223



From: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2026 4:47 PM
To: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>; elena@judgewatch.org
Subject: RE: FOIL/Records Request: The Judiciary's FY2026-27 Budget Submission

Please be advised that we require additional time to complete our response to your FOIL request dated 1/26/26. We will provide you with a response on or before March 26, 2026.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter.

Sincerely,

FOIL Officer
Office of Court Administration
Agency Building 4 ESP, Suite 2001
Albany, NY 12223



From: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 4:37 PM
To: elena@judgewatch.org
Cc: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>
Subject: RE: FOIL/Records Request: The Judiciary's FY2026-27 Budget Submission

The Office of Court Administration acknowledges receipt of your FOIL request dated 1/26/26, seeking:

The Judiciary's FY 2026-27 budget submission bears your name on its cover and its first page is your two-sentence December 1, 2025 transmitting memorandum. Pursuant to Public Officers Law

Article VI (“Freedom of Information Law”) and Part 124 of the Rules of the Chief Administrative Judge (“Public Access to Records”), this is to request:

- (1) records reflecting which are “the attached schedules”, referred to by the November 20, 2025 “Chief Judge’s Certification” as constituting “the itemized estimates of the financial needs of the Judiciary for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 2026...approved by the Court of Appeals”.
- (2) records reflecting which are the “attached itemized estimates”, referred to by the November 20, 2025 “Court of Appeals Approval”.
- (3) records defining the terms “State Operating Cash Estimate” and “All Funds Cash Estimate”, appearing in the first two paragraphs of the “Introduction” – and why the dollar amount of the “All Funds Cash Estimate” and its percentage increase is NOT furnished, as it is for the “State Operating Cash Estimate”, to wit, “The FY 2027 State Operating Cash Estimate of \$3.2 billion reflects an increase of \$199 million (6.7%) over FY 2026” (1st page of “Introduction”, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence).
- (4) any narrative explanation of the two charts entitled “Judiciary All Funds Disbursement Requirements (In Millions)” and “Judiciary All Funds Appropriation Requirements”, and, specifically, why two charts are needed, the definition of “FY 2026 Available” from which the dollar amounts of the “Change” is calculated, and why neither chart identifies “Reappropriations”.
- (5) records as to why the Judiciary’s 17-page “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – so identified by the “Table of Contents” – is only titled “The Judiciary” – and why it begins at §2 and then continues, ten pages later, with §3 for “Reappropriations”.
- (6) records explaining/interpreting the two introductory “Notwithstanding” provisions on page 1 of the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – and:
 - (i) pertaining to the first, records as to the amount of monies “transferred to the attorney licensing fund” from “the state treasury pursuant to subdivision 1 of section 465 of the judiciary law” in the FY2025-26 fiscal year based on the identical provision in the Judiciary’s FY2025-26 Bill, and,
 - (ii) pertaining to the second, records as to the number of “contracts with the center for justice innovation”, approved by you and filed with the comptroller and their amounts, pursuant to the identical corresponding provision in the Judiciary’s FY2025-26 Bill.
- (7) records germane to the “Notwithstanding” provision on page 1 of the Bill under the heading “State Operations 2026-27”, to wit, your approval of increases and decreases by interchange in FY2025-26, pursuant to the identical provision in the Judiciary’s FY2025-26 Bill, and, specifically, how many and what they were.
- (8) records establishing why the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” (at pp. 1, 10-17) includes “Reappropriations”, when such are NOT mentioned anywhere else in the Judiciary’s budget submission, to wit, (i) its five-page “Introduction”, (ii) its two charts; (iii) its three-part “FY 2027 Judiciary Budget Request” section which includes “Aid to Localities” and “Capital Projects”; and (iv) its “General State Charges” section.
- (9) records showing that the “Reappropriations” (at pp. 1, 10-17) meet the definition of what is suitable for reappropriation, such as the Division of the Budget identifies in its “Citizen’s Guide”/“Financial Terminology” – apart from the first entry under “Aid to Localities Reappropriations 2026-27” (at p. 14) and the entries under “Capital Project Reappropriations 2026-27” (at pp. 15-16).
- (10) records as to what is the total dollar amount of the “Judiciary Appropriation Bill” – and why

that amount is NOT identified on the Bill's first page – or thereafter.

(11) records as to what is the total dollar amount of the "Appropriations" requested by the "Judiciary Appropriation Bill" – and why that amount is NOT identified on the Bill's first page – or thereafter.

(12) records as to what is the total dollar amount of the "Reappropriations" requested by the "Judiciary Appropriation Bill" – and why that amount is NOT identified on the Bill's first page – or thereafter.

(13) records reflecting the dollar amount requested by the Judiciary's FY2026-27 budget submission for what it identifies in its "Introduction" under the heading "Core Operations Funding Summary" (at p. ii) as:

"A salary increase of 2% for all judges and justices, as authorized by the New York State Commission on Legislative, Judicial and Executive Compensation in 2023" (underlining added) –

then transmogrified in the budget's section on "Courts of Original Jurisdiction" as "Funding is also included for a 2% judicial salary increase, as required by law" (at p. 4) and repeated as "a 2% judicial salary increase, as required by law" (at pp. 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 29) and, likewise, in its sections on the "Court of Appeals" (at p. 56) and "Appellate Court Operations" (at p. 59) as "a 2% judicial salary increase, as required by law (underlining added).

(14) records reflecting why the "Judiciary Appropriation Bill" contains no line item for the dollar amount of the "salary increase of 2% for all judges and justices, as authorized by the New York State Commission on Legislative, Judicial and Executive Compensation in 2023".

(15) records as to why the Judiciary's FY26-27 budget submission for its "Attorney Discipline Program" – part of "Appellate Auxiliary Operations" (at pp. 84-85) – seeks \$17,392,000, with an accompanying text stating that this is "an increase of \$0.1 million (0.6%) over the current year adjusted appropriation" – without revealing that the Judiciary's FY25-26 budget request of \$17,287,000 for the "Attorney Discipline Program (at pp. 81-82) was \$486,853 LESS than its FY24-25 request of \$17,773,853 (at pp. 107-109), in other words, the current request is \$381,853 LESS than the request of two years ago.

(16) records as to why, in contrast to the Judiciary's prior budget submissions which had identified the "Office of the Inspector General" as part of its "Court Support Services Program" of its "Courts of Original Jurisdiction" and specified the appropriation for it,⁵ the comparable section of the FY26-27 budget submission (at pp. 39-42), identically to its FY25-26 budget submission (at pp. 39-42), omits the Office of the Inspector General whose jurisdiction includes non-judicial personnel – and a search of the FY26-27 budget submission brings up ZERO results.

(17) records reflecting the Judiciary's intended FY26-27 appropriation for the Office of the Inspector General – and what the appropriation was for FY25-26.

We have begun to process your request, and we will provide you with a response on or before February 26, 2026.

Sincerely,

FOIL Officer
Office of Court Administration
Agency Building 4 ESP, Suite 2001

Albany, NY 12223



From: elena@judgewatch.org <elena@judgewatch.org>

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 2:00 PM

To: Hon. Joseph A. Zayas <jzayas@nycourts.gov>; cmartucci@nycourts.gov

Cc: FOIL <FOIL@nycourts.gov>; lkrueger@nysenate.gov; financechair@nysenate.gov; omara@nysenate.gov; PretloJ@nyassembly.gov; wamchair@nyassembly.gov; rae@nyassembly.gov; sepulveda@nysenate.gov; Palumbo@nysenate.gov; LavineC@nyassembly.gov; tannousism@nyassembly.gov

Subject: FOIL/Records Request: The Judiciary's FY2026-27 Budget Submission

TO: Chief Administrative Judge Joseph Zayas

cc: Office of Court Administration FOIL Officer/Assistant Deputy Counsel Sevil Barber

Senate Finance Committee Chair Krueger & Ranking Member O'Mara
Assembly Ways & Means Committee Chair Pretlow & Ranking Member Ra
Senate Judiciary Committee Chair Sepulveda & Ranking Member Palumbo
Assembly Judiciary Committee Chair Lavine & Ranking Member Tannousis

Above attached is CJA's FOIL/records request of today's date entitled "The Judiciary's FY2026-27 Budget Submission".

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org