



**SENT VIA EMAIL TO AD1-AGC-newcomplaints@nycourts.gov**

March 3, 2026

Attorney Grievance Committee  
Supreme Court, Appellate Division  
First Judicial Department  
180 Maiden Lane  
New York, NY 10038

**RE: Complaint regarding Attorney Rebecca Michelle (“Mikie”) Sherrill’s potential violation of the New York Rules of Professional Conduct**

To Whom it May Concern,

This complaint addresses potential violations of the New York Rules of Professional Conduct by Attorney Rebecca Michelle (“Mikie”) Sherrill. We ask that you initiate an investigation into Sherrill due to her potential violation of the law through, among other things, her call for the creation of a state-run system to aid in the potential obstruction of federal immigration enforcement activities.

**I. Who We Are**

The Center to Advance Security in America (CASA) is a nonpartisan organization dedicated to improving the safety and security of the American people. CASA educates and informs the American people about the actions of their government and its officials that impact their safety; peace and security; democracy, civil rights, and civil liberties; and privacy.

**II. Background and Allegations in Complaint**

Based on information and belief, Rebecca Michelle (“Mikie”) Sherrill is a licensed attorney in the State of New York with the Attorney Registration number 4719522, admitted to practice by the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Department on May 4, 2009. Based upon information and belief, she is in good standing as of this submission.<sup>1</sup> She is currently the Governor of New Jersey.

On or about January 28, 2026, Sherrill went onto the Daily Show and detailed her plan to obstruct ICE in its efforts to enforce immigration laws in New Jersey. “If you see an ICE agent in

---

<sup>1</sup> New York State Unified Court System, “Attorney Detail Report as of 10/17/2025-Rebecca Michelle Sherrill,” <https://iapps.courts.state.ny.us/attorneyservices/wicket/page/DetailsPage?2>



the street, get your phone out,” she told the host and her audience. She also said that “we will not allow ICE raids to be staged from state property” and that the state government would be creating a “portal” so people can “upload all their cell phone videos” for the purpose to “alert people” of ICE presence.<sup>2</sup>

This is not Sherrill’s only recent example of saying controversial and potentially illegal statements. On October 8, 2025, Sherrill, during a New Jersey gubernatorial debate, accused her opponent, Jack Ciattarelli, of mass homicide, saying to him: “I’m so glad that you went on to kill tens of thousands of people in New Jersey, including children.” She accused him of causing addiction to opioids. “The people you got addicted and died deserve better than you.” After her cheating scandal at the Naval Academy was brought up, Sherrill doubled down: “I think you’re trying to divert from the fact that you killed tens of thousands of people by printing your misinformation your propaganda and then being paid to develop an app so that people could more easily get the opioids once they were addicted.”<sup>3</sup>

While Ciattarelli did run a business that involved an app for pharmaceuticals, her claim that he was in any way connected to killing someone was rejected by PolitiFact, which stated that “There is no evidence that Ciattarelli ‘killed’ anyone.”<sup>4</sup> New Jersey Globe published the same conclusion.<sup>5</sup> Yet, Sherrill has not retracted her claim.

Sherrill also has abused her position in Congress to further pecuniary gain. The New York Post recently reported that Sherrill has gained considerable wealth since joining Congress. “In 2019, Sherrill’s net worth would’ve been between \$730,00 and \$4.3 million, per her house financial disclosure records. By 2024, it jumped to between \$4.8 million and \$14 million.”<sup>6</sup> It has also been reported that, in 2021, Sherrill paid a fine for violating the STOCK Act, which requires members of Congress to report stock trades within 40 days.<sup>7</sup> “Sherrill...was months late

---

<sup>2</sup> Alya Schneider and Jeff Gammage, “Gov. Mikie Sherrill says N.J. Will Create a Database for Uploading Videos of ICE: ‘Get your phone out,’” The Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 29, 2026, <https://www.inquirer.com/politics/new-jersey/mikie-sherrill-ice-immigration-videos-trump-20260129.html>. (The video of this interview is imbedded in the article).

<sup>3</sup> Eyewitness News ABC7NY, “LIVE Watch the New Jersey Gubernatorial Debate Between Mikie Sherrill and Jack Ciattarelli,” October 8, 2025, 2:33:15, <https://youtu.be/YAKKACnQV1I>. (starting 1:09:06).

<sup>4</sup> Zach Blackburn et. al., “Fact-Checking new Jersey’s Second Gubernatorial Debate,” PolitiFact, October 9, 2025, <https://www.politifact.com/article/2025/oct/09/new-jersey-governor-debate-sherrill-ciattarelli/>.

<sup>5</sup> Zach Blackburn et. al., “Fact-Checking New Jersey’s Second Gubernatorial Debate,” New Jersey Globe, Accessed October 17, 2025, <https://newjerseyglobe.com/governor/fact-checking-new-jerseys-second-gubernatorial-debate/>.

<sup>6</sup> Ryan King, “How Mike Sherrill’s Family Made Millions After She was Elected to Congress,” New York Post, October 1, 2025, <https://patch.com/new-jersey/across-nj/3-nj-congress-members-fined-stock-violations-report>.

<sup>7</sup> John Bakan, “3 NJ Congress Members Fined For Stock Violations: Report,” Patch, June 13, 2022, <https://patch.com/new-jersey/across-nj/3-nj-congress-members-fined-stock-violations-report>.



disclosing two sales of vested stock her husband earned from his employment” with a value of “up to \$350,000.” Sherrill’s office claims that this step was done proactively.<sup>8</sup>

### III. Ethics Standards

In New York, a lawyer may be disciplined for “illegal conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer’s honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer” or “conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.”<sup>9</sup>

It is a federal crime to “harbor certain aliens.” Any person who “knowing[ly] or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law, conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, such alien in any place, including any building or any means of transportation,” is punishable to up to 10 years in prison or fine.<sup>10</sup>

Defamation requires the following elements in New Jersey:

1. A false statement about an individual;
2. Communication of the statement to a third party;
3. Fault of the declarant amounting to at least negligence;
4. Damages suffered by the defamed individual.<sup>11</sup>

Prong three would be heightened for a public official, with the declarant having to have made the statement with “actual malice,” which means “false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false or not.”<sup>12</sup> Additionally, “slander *per se*” is a heightened form of defamation that does not require damages to be proven because the accusation is, by its very nature, damaging.<sup>13</sup> It is slander *per se* to falsely accuse someone of a criminal offense or of “characteristics or a condition that is incompatible with his business, trade or office,” among other categories.<sup>14</sup>

### IV. Analysis

Here, Sherrill has taken the first step toward concealing illegal aliens in New Jersey by calling for people to video any ICE activity and to alert the New Jersey government via web portal. This means that the call to action has already occurred. The statute does not require concealment to have already been carried out. Rather “attempts to conceal” is enough.

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> New York Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(b)&(c).

<sup>10</sup> 8 U.S.C. §1324(a)(1)(A)(iii); (B).

<sup>11</sup> See *DeAngelis v. Hill*, 847 A.2d 1261, 1267-68 (N.J. 2004).

<sup>12</sup> *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 280 (1964).

<sup>13</sup> *Biondi v. Nassimos*, 300 N.J. Super. 148, 154 (1997).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*



In her interview, Sherrill explicitly said to do two things: video ICE activity with cell phones and to “alert people.” Alerting people can be for no other reason than to allow undocumented immigrants time to clear out of their location. The effort can be interpreted in no other way than to prevent ICE from detaining immigrants who are the subject of their search. This violates the explicit language of the federal criminal statute referenced above. It is “deceit[ful]” to use the power of government to prevent the federal government from being able to perform their operations. Additionally, it is unbecoming of a lawyer to use her power under the law to undermine federal law.

With regard to Sherrill’s statements during her debate, they were illegal because they constitute defamation *per se*, with malice. Her very words signal that she does not believe Ciattarelli to have murdered anyone, yet she stated it multiple times. She understands that all that Ciattarelli did was run a business that created an app for prescription drugs. Yet she connects that to murdering tens of thousands of people, including children. This is clearly false, as stated by multiple fact checkers. She communicated it to a wide audience, both those who were watching the debate and those who consumed the media about the debate. She said so knowing it not to be true. And, Ciattarelli endured both professional and personal harm as a result of the statements (though, with it being defamation *per se*, damages would not be required). Sherrill’s actions were “illegal.”

Additionally, by their very nature of being defamatory, they reflect upon her “honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer” and involves “deceit or misrepresentation.” Defamation is by default dishonest. And, by default it means one’s words are not trustworthy and misrepresentation. If Sherrill is willing to misrepresent facts on a debate stage, she is also unfit to be an advocate in a legal setting.

Her failure to comply with the STOCK Act is likewise a troubling act which calls into question her honesty and trustworthiness. Sherrill knew her obligations to report stock trading, yet she didn’t. That is not only illegal, but it calls into question her “honesty” and “trustworthiness” and constitutes “deceit or misrepresentation.” It is no matter that she reported the violation and paid proactively. It was done months after the fact and well after she cashed in for hundreds of thousands of dollars. Additionally, it begs the question: what else has Sherrill failed to report while she made millions in Congress?

## **V. Conclusion**

Misrepresentation, honesty, and trustworthiness are all factors that the Rules of Professional Conduct expressly factor when weighing whether to discipline an attorney. Each of Sherrill’s actions, independently and collectively, call into question those factors. The Committee, therefore, should waste no time before investigating the allegations against Sherrill and, if the evidence is substantiated, discipline her accordingly.



Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Curtis Schube  
Director of Research and Policy  
Center to Advance Security in America  
[www.advancing-america.org](http://www.advancing-america.org)  
@SecureUSA