- 1 AN ACT relating to judicial review of state agency action.
- WHEREAS, in Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U.S. 369 (2024), the
- 3 United States Supreme Court ruled that the federal judiciary's deference to the
- 4 interpretation of statutes by federal agencies as articulated in Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v.
- 5 Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 487 U.S. 837 (1984), and its progeny was
- 6 unlawful; and
- WHEREAS, the opinions in several cases decided by the Kentucky Supreme Court,
- 8 including without limitation, Metzinger v. Kentucky Retirement Systems, 299 S.W. 3d
- 9 541 (Ky. 2009), and Kentucky Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission v.
- 10 Estill County Fiscal Court, 503 S.W. 3d 924 (Ky. 2016), appeared to adopt the deference
- articulated in the Chevron decision as a model for the review by the Kentucky Court of
- 12 Justice of a state agency's interpretation of statutes; and
- WHEREAS, the General Assembly does not create state agencies with an
- expectation that those agencies will possess a proficiency in interpreting a statute that is
- superior to that of the Court of Justice; and
- WHEREAS, the General Assembly does not believe that any state agency possesses
- a proficiency in interpreting a statute that is superior to that of the Court of Justice; and
- 18 WHEREAS, the General Assembly believes that judicial deference to a state
- agency's interpretation of a statute is inconsistent with the role of the Court of Justice
- within the separation of powers provisions of the Constitution of Kentucky; and
- 21 WHEREAS, the General Assembly declares that de novo review is the only
- 22 appropriate standard for judicial review of a state agency's interpretation of a statute or
- 23 regulation;
- NOW, THEREFORE,
- 25 Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:
- 26 → SECTION 1. A NEW SECTION OF KRS CHAPTER 13A IS CREATED TO
- 27 READ AS FOLLOWS:

1	<i>(1)</i>	An	administrative body shall not interpret a statute or administrative regulation								
2		with	the expectation that the interpretation of the administrative body is entitled								
3		to de	eference from a reviewing court.								
4	<u>(2)</u>	The	interpretation of a statute or administrative regulation by an administrative								
5		<u>bod</u>	y shall not be entitled to deference from a reviewing court.								
6		→ S	ECTION 2. A NEW SECTION OF KRS CHAPTER 446 IS CREATED TO								
7	REA	AD AS	S FOLLOWS:								
8	$\underline{A} c$	ourt	reviewing an administrative body's action, including without limitation a								
9	<u>petit</u>	tion f	or judicial review of an administrative body's rulemaking or adjudicatory								
10	<u>acti</u>	ons, s	shall apply de novo review to the administrative body's interpretation of								
11	<u>stati</u>	utes, a	dministrative regulations, and other questions of law.								
12		→ S	ection 3. KRS 13B.150 is amended to read as follows:								
13	(1)	Exc	ept as provided in KRS 452.005, review of a final order shall be conducted by								
14		the o	court without a jury and shall be confined to the record, unless there is fraud or								
15		miso	conduct involving a party engaged in administration of this chapter. The court,								
16		upo	n request, may hear oral argument and receive written briefs. Challenges to the								
17		cons	stitutionality of a final order shall be reviewed in accordance with KRS 452.005.								
18	(2)	The	court shall not substitute its judgment for that of the agency as to the weight of								
19		the	evidence on questions of fact. The court may affirm the final order or it may								
20		reverse the final order, in whole or in part, and remand the case for further									
21		proceedings if it finds the agency's final order is:									
22		(a)	In violation of constitutional or statutory provisions;								
23		(b)	In excess of the statutory authority of the agency;								
24		(c)	Without support of substantial evidence on the whole record;								
25		(d)	Arbitrary, capricious, or characterized by abuse of discretion;								
26		(e)	Based on an ex parte communication which substantially prejudiced the rights								
27			of any party and likely affected the outcome of the hearing;								

1	(f)	Prejudiced	by	a	failure	of	the	person	conducting	a	proceeding	to	be
2		disqualified	pur	sua	ant to KI	RS 1	3B.0	040(2); c	or				

- 3 (g) Deficient as otherwise provided by law.
- 4 (3) The court shall apply de novo review of the agency's final order on questions of
- 5 <u>law. An agency's interpretation of a statute or administrative regulation shall not</u>
- 6 <u>be entitled to deference from a reviewing court.</u>