

PRESENTED AT
26th Annual Labor and Employment Law Conference
May 9-10, 2019
Austin, Texas

Religious Freedom in the Workplace
By Lee Crawford

Author Contact Information:

B. Lee Crawford Jr.
City of Austin Law Department
Austin, Texas 78701
Lee.Crawford@austintexas.gov
512.974.2421

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND RELIGION IN THE WORKPLACE.....	2
	A. Free Exercise Clause Cases.....	2
	B. Other Constitutional Cases.....	4
III.	REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION OF RELIGION UNDER EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION LAWS	8
	A. Federal Law under Title VII	8
	• Key Supreme Court Decisions.....	8
	• Representative Fifth Circuit Decisions	11
	• The Ministerial Exemption in Title VII.....	13
	• EEOC Regulations and Compliance Manual Guidance.	14
	B. State Law under Texas Labor Code Chapter 21	16
IV.	“RELIGIOUS FREEDOM” STATUTES AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE	18
	A. Federal Law – RFRA	19
	B. State Law – TRFRA and Other Religious Exemption Laws	24
	C. Regulatory Guidance	27
APPENDICES		
	• Appendix 1: 29 CFR Part 1605 – Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion	
	• Appendix 2: EEOC Compliance Manual – Part 12-IV – Reasonable Accommodation	
	• Appendix 3: Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Chapter 110 – Religious Freedom	
	• Appendix 4: House Bill 1035 (86 th Leg. 2019) – Free to Believe Act	
	• Appendix 5: Memorandum from U.S. Attorney General to Executive Departments and Agencies re “Federal Law Protections for Religious Liberty” (Oct. 6, 2017)	

CASES CITED IN THIS PAPER

	<u>Page</u>
Federal Cases	
<i>A.A. ex rel. Betenbaugh v. Needville Ind. School Dist.</i> , 611 F.3d 248 (5 th Cir. 2010)	26
<i>Arizona Board of Education v. Philbrook</i> , 479 U.S. 60, 107 S.Ct. 367 (1986)	10
<i>Barr v. City of Sinton</i> , 295 S.W. 3d 287 (Tex. 2009).....	25
<i>Brown v. Polk Co.</i> , 61 F.3d 650 (8 th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, 516 U.S. 1158 (1996)	16
<i>Burrell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 682, 134 S.Ct. 2751 (2014).....	20
<i>Cantwell v. Connecticut</i> , 310 U.S. 296, 60 S.Ct. 900 (1940)	2
<i>Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, Florida</i> , 508 U.S. 520, 113 S.Ct. 2217 (1993) 4	
<i>City of Boerne, Texas v. Flores</i> , 521 U.S. 507, 117 S.Ct. 2157 (1997)	5
<i>Collins v. Tarrant Appraisal District</i> , 100 FEP Cases (BNA) 1751 (Tex. App. – Ft. Worth 2007, no writ)	18
<i>Colon v. Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship/USA</i> , 777 F.3d 829, 834 (6 th Cir. 2015)	14
<i>Corp. of Presiding Bishop of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. Amos</i> , 483 U.S. 327, 335-36 (1987).....	14
<i>Davis v. Ft. Bend County</i> , 765 F.3d 480 (5 th Cir. 2014), cert. denied, 135 S.Ct. 2804 (2015).....	11
<i>Dewey v Reynolds Metals Co.</i> , 429 F.2d 324 (6 th Cir. 1970).....	8
<i>E.E.O.C. et al. v. R.G. & G.R. Harris Funeral Homes, Inc.</i> , 884 F.3d 560 (6 th Cir. 2018), cert. granted in part, U.S. Sup. Ct. Docket No. 18-107 (April 22, 2019)	19, 22
<i>E.E.O.C. v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc.</i> , ___ U.S. ___, 135 S.Ct. 2028 (2015)	10
<i>EEOC v. Red Robin Gourmet Burgers, Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 2090677 (W.D. Wash. 2005).....	15
<i>Estate of Thornton v. Caldor</i> , 472 U.S. 703, 105 S. Ct. 2914 (1985).....	5
<i>Eversley v. MBank Dallas</i> , 843 F.2d 172 (5 th Cir. 1988)	12
<i>General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists v. McGill</i> , 617 F.3d 402, 409 (6 th Cir. 2010)	19
<i>Grant v. Joe Myers Toyota, Inc.</i> , 11 S.W.3d 419 (Tex. App. Dallas 2000).....	17
<i>Hobbie v. Unemployment Appeals Comm. of Florida</i> , 480 U.S. 136, 107 S.Ct. 1046 (1987).....	3
<i>Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & School v. EEOC</i> , 565 U.S. 171, 132 S.Ct. 694 (2012). 14	
<i>In Employment Division, Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith</i> , 494 U.S. 872, 110 S.Ct. 1595 (1990).....	3
<i>Jones v. Angelo State University</i> , 2016 WL 3228412 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2016, rev. denied Oct. 20, 2017)	17
<i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i> , 403 U.S. 602, 91 S.Ct. 2105 (1971).....	7
<i>Locke v. Davey</i> , 540 U.S. 712, 124 S.Ct. 1307 (2004)	7

<i>Merced v. Kasson</i> , 577 F.3d 578 (5 th Cir. 2009).....	25
<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> , ____ U.S. ____, 135 S. Ct. 2584 (2015).....	27
<i>Quantum Chem. Corp. v. Toennies</i> , 47 S.W.3d 473, 476 (Tex. 2001)	16
<i>Reed v. United Auto Workers</i> , 569 F.3d 576 (6 th Cir. 2009).....	15
<i>Reynolds v. United States</i> , 98 U.S. 145, 166-67 (1878).....	2
<i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> , 374 U.S. 398 (1963)	2
<i>Spicer v. Texas Workforce Commission</i> , 430 S.W.3d 526 (Tex. App. Dallas – 2014, no pet.)	6
<i>Tagore v. United States</i> , 735 F.3d 324 (5 th Cir. 2013).....	13
<i>Thomas v. Review Bd. of Indiana Employment Security Div.</i> , 450 U.S. 707, 101 S.Ct. 1425 (1981)	3
<i>Trans World Airlines, Inc. v. Hardison</i> , 432 U.S. 63, 97 S.Ct. 2264, 53 L.Ed.2d 113 (1977)	8

State Cases

<i>Barr v. City of Sinton</i> , 295 S.W. 3d 287 (Tex. 2009).....	25
<i>Collins v. Tarrant Appraisal District</i> , 100 FEP Cases (BNA) 1751 (Tex. App. – Ft. Worth 2007, no writ)	18
<i>Grant v. Joe Myers Toyota, Inc.</i> , 11 S.W.3d 419 (Tex. App. Dallas 2000).....	17
<i>Jones v. Angelo State University</i> , 2016 WL 3228412 (Tex. App. – Austin, 2016, rev. denied Oct. 20, 2017)	17
<i>Quantum Chem. Corp. v. Toennies</i> , 47 S.W.3d 473, 476 (Tex. 2001)	16
<i>Spicer v. Texas Workforce Commission</i> , 430 S.W.3d 526 (Tex. App. Dallas – 2014, no pet.)	6
<i>Thomas v. Review Bd. of Indiana Employment Security Div.</i> , 450 U.S. 707, 101 S.Ct. 1425 (1981)	3
<i>Trans World Airlines, Inc. v. Hardison</i> , 432 U.S. 63, 97 S.Ct. 2264, 53 L.Ed.2d 113 (1977)	8

Religious Freedom in the Workplace

By Lee Crawford ¹

May 2019

I. INTRODUCTION

Attorneys who advise or litigate on issues involving religious practices in the workplace quickly discover a complex matrix of constitutional principles, federal and state laws, judicial opinions, and administrative regulations and guidance that support multiple – and sometimes conflicting – public policy goals. Most people can readily accept the core principle that government should not unreasonably interfere with the religious beliefs and expressions of an individual or a group, and most will also agree that a person's religion should not be factor in their employment absent special circumstances. But consistently through the history of American jurisprudence – and with increasing zeal in recent years – both lawmakers and litigants have tested the boundaries and expanded the scope of these core principles. The result today is a legal landscape that is challenging to navigate, with many important questions still not fully developed.

The relationship between religion and the civil law has been a dynamic and enduring element of American life going back to the earliest days of our nation.² The First Amendment to our Constitution contains two parameters defining the relationship between government and religion – the Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause – each of which has been a source of many vigorous workplace disputes when the government acts either as an employer or the provider of public benefits or restrictions. In more recent years, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act extended the legal protection of religious beliefs and practices to the private sector workplace by prohibiting discrimination in employment based on religion, and extending that protection to include an affirmative duty on employers to accommodate employees' religious beliefs and practices. Most recently, both Congress and state legislatures have enacted laws intended to protect the free exercise of religious beliefs both employees and employers from any government interference absent a showing that the restriction furthered a compelling governmental interest. The interplay of these multiple sources of law often makes for challenging legal analysis of issues that touch on religion in the current American workplace.

This paper highlights the sources of laws protecting or concerning religious freedom in the workplace and discusses significant judicial opinions particularly relevant to practitioners in the Fifth Circuit that have defined the scope and parameters of these laws. Part II of this paper

¹ Division Chief, City of Austin Law Department. This paper also includes information and case references taken from many excellent secondary sources. Three sources of note for those wishing to read more on this topic are: Brown & Scott, *Belief v. Belief: Resolving LGBTQ Rights Conflicts in the Religious Workplace*, 56 Amer. Business Law J. 55 (Spring 2019); Nahmod, *The Establishment Clause, the Free Exercise Clause, RFRA and RLUIPA*, New Mexico State Bar Convention (August 2017); and Wolanek & Liu, *Applying Strict Scrutiny: An Empirical Analysis of Free Exercise Cases*, 78 Mont. L. Rev. 275 (2017).

² For an excellent discussion of the role that religion has played in the founding and development of American society and culture, see Jon Meacham, *American Gospel: God, the Founding Fathers, and the Making of America* (Random House, LLC 2006).

describes the evolution of First Amendment religious protection jurisprudence focusing on cases involving workplace issues. Part III discusses prohibited employment discrimination based on religion and the duty to reasonably accommodate an employee's religious beliefs and practices under Title VII and Texas Labor Code Chapter 21. Part IV describes the development of federal and state laws that create statutory (but not Constitutional) prohibitions on government actions that impinge on the religious beliefs and expression of employees and employers. The five Appendices at the end of the paper include some of the important regulations and guidances that are referenced in the paper.

II. THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND RELIGION IN THE WORKPLACE

A. Free Exercise Clause Cases

The First Amendment guarantees, among other things, both the right of free exercise of religion (the Free Exercise Clause) and the right to be free from government establishment of religion (the Establishment Clause). Historically the Free Exercise Clause has been the primary source of Constitutional protection for individuals to practice their faith without government interference.³ However, like all Constitutional rights, the Free Exercise Clause has always had parameters. In an early case testing whether laws criminalizing polygamy could be applied to a person whose religious beliefs compelled it, the Supreme Court held that excusing that person from compliance with laws on the basis of their religious beliefs would “make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself.” *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145, 166-67 (1878). This core principle – that all persons must comply with laws of general applicability, regardless of their personal religious beliefs – remained the governing Constitutional principle for the next 85 years.

The Free Exercise Clause has been applied in many employment-related cases over the past 60 years. In 1963 the Supreme Court shifted the legal analysis for Free Exercise cases in *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), an unemployment compensation benefits case, from a focus on the general applicability of the law in question to a test based on the Constitutional strict scrutiny standard. In that case the Court overturned a denial of unemployment benefits to an employee who was fired when she refused to work on a Saturday, which was her Sabbath day. Although the state statute disqualifying the employee from benefits was neutral on its face and applied equally to everyone, the Court used the case to articulate a new standard for evaluating Free Exercise cases which asked whether the burden imposed by the government action on the claimant's religious freedom advances a compelling state interest in the least restrictive manner. *Id.* at 403, 406-07. While the Court did occasionally reconfirm the importance of uniform laws of general application in the years that followed, see, e.g., *United States v. Lee*, 455 U.S. 252 (1982) (rejecting claim by Amish employers that their religion forbade them from paying social security taxes), this compelling interest standard remained the test for Free Exercise cases for the next quarter century following *Sherbert v. Verner*. See, e.g., *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 213-15 (1972)

³ The Free Exercise Clause, which is part of the First Amendment, provides that “Congress shall make no law . . . prohibiting the free exercise [of religion].” The First Amendment is, of course, applicable to the States through the Fourteenth Amendment. See, e.g., *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 60 S.Ct. 900 (1940).

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2019 Labor and Employment Law eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
26th Annual Labor and Employment Law Conference session
"Religious Freedom in the Workplace"