

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
STATE BAR OF TEXAS
GRIEVANCE FORM

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Before you fill out this paperwork, there may be a faster way to resolve the issue you are currently having with an attorney.

If you are considering filing a grievance against a Texas attorney for any of the following reasons:

- ~ You believe your attorney is neglecting your case.
- ~ Your attorney does not return phone calls or keep you informed about the status of your case.
- ~ You have fired your attorney but are having problems getting your file back from the attorney.

You may want to consider contacting the Client-Attorney Assistance Program (CAAP) at 1-800-932-1900.

CAAP was established by the State Bar of Texas to help people resolve these kinds of issues with attorneys quickly, without the filing of a formal grievance.

CAAP can resolve many problems without a grievance being filed by providing information, by suggesting various self-help options for dealing with the situation, or by contacting the attorney either by telephone or letter.

NA I have _____ I have not _____ contacted the Client-Attorney Assistance Program.

NOTE: Please be sure to fill out each section completely. Do not leave any section blank. If you do not know the answer to any question, write "I don't know."

II. INFORMATION ABOUT YOU -- PLEASE KEEP CURRENT

1. TDCJ/SID # _____ Mr. Ms. Name: Glen Maxey
Immigration # _____

Address: 601 W 26th #B

City: Austin State: TX Zip Code: 78705

2. Employer: Texas Democratic Party
 Employer's Address: 4818 E Ben White Blvd Ste 104
Austin TX 78741
3. Telephone numbers: Residence: — Work: —
 Cell: 512 656-6337
4. Email: glen@glenmaxey.com
5. Drivers License # 06236447 Date of Birth 2/23/52
6. Name, address, and telephone number of person who can always reach you.
 Name _____ Address _____
 _____ Telephone _____
7. Do you understand and write in the English language? Yes
 If no, what is your primary language? —
 Who helped you prepare this form? —
 Will they be available to translate future correspondence during this process? —
8. Are you a Judge? No
 If yes, please provide Court, County, City, State: —

III. INFORMATION ABOUT ATTORNEY

Note: Grievances are not accepted against law firms. You must specifically name the attorney against whom you are complaining. A separate grievance form must be completed for each attorney against whom you are complaining.

1. Attorney name: Ken Paxton Address: 300 W 15th St
 City: Austin State: TX Zip Code: 78701
2. Telephone number: Work 512 463 2100 Home — Other _____
3. Have you or a member of your family filed a grievance about this attorney previously?
 Yes ___ No If "yes", please state its approximate date and outcome. _____

Have you or a member of your family ever filed an appeal with the Board of Disciplinary Appeals about this attorney?

Yes ___ No If "yes," please state its approximate date and outcome.

4. Please check one of the following:

- This attorney was **hired** to represent me.
 This attorney was **appointed** to represent me.
 This attorney was hired to represent **someone else**.

Please give the date the attorney was hired or appointed. Jan 1 2015

Please state what the attorney was hired or appointed to do. _____

defend me as a resident of Texas
and uphold the Constitution

5. What was your fee arrangement with the attorney? _____

My taxes pay his salary

How much did you pay the attorney? \$150,000 as State

Attorney General

If you signed a contract and have a copy, please attach. NA
If you have copies of checks and/or receipts, please attach. NA
Do not send originals.

6. If you did not hire the attorney, what is your connection with the attorney? Explain briefly

NA

7. Are you currently represented by an attorney? No

If yes, please provide information about your current attorney: _____

8. Do you claim the attorney has an impairment, such as depression or a substance use disorder? If yes, please provide specifics (your **personal** observations of the attorney such as slurred speech, odor of alcohol, ingestion of alcohol or drugs in your presence etc., including the date you observed this, the time of day, and location).

NA

9. Did the attorney ever make any statements or admissions to you or in your presence that would indicate that the attorney may be experiencing an impairment, such as depression or a substance use disorder? If so, please provide details.

NA

IV. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR GRIEVANCE

1. Where did the activity you are complaining about occur?

County: TRAVIS City: Austin

2. If your grievance is about a lawsuit, answer the following, if known:

a. Name of court NA

b. Title of the suit —

c. Case number and date suit was filed —

d. If you are not a party to this suit, what is your connection with it? Explain briefly.

—

If you have copies of court documents, please attach.

3. Explain in detail why you think this attorney has done something improper or has failed to do something which should have been done. Attach additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Attached

If you have copies of letters or other documents you believe are relevant to your grievance, please attach. Do not send originals, as they will not be returned. Additionally, please do not use staples, post-it notes, or binding.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yellow Pages	<input type="checkbox"/>	CAAP
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internet	<input type="checkbox"/>	Attorney
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Website

VI. ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE WAIVER

I hereby expressly waive any attorney-client privilege as to the attorney, the subject of this grievance, and authorize such attorney to reveal any information in the professional relationship to the Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel of the State Bar of Texas.

I understand that the Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel maintains as confidential the processing of Grievances.

Signature: Shen M. Mays Date: 6/30/15

TO ENSURE PROMPT ATTENTION, THE GRIEVANCE SHOULD BE MAILED TO:

THE OFFICE OF CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 13287
Austin, Texas 78711

Complaint

Ken Paxton, who currently occupies the office of Texas Attorney General, has issued an opinion that advises state and county officials to violate the United States Constitution. On June 26, 2015, the United States Supreme Court held in *Obergefell v. Hodges* that a constitutional right exists for same-sex couples to marry. Additionally, the Western District of Texas has now enjoined the State of Texas (including Paxton) from enforcing Texas laws that define marriage as exclusively a union between one man and one woman. Despite those binding rulings, and in flagrant violation of those rulings and the United States Constitution, Paxton has advised state government officials and employees, including county clerks, judges, and justices of the peace, that they may refuse to issue same-sex marriage licenses or conduct same-sex marriage ceremonies if doing so would “violate their sincerely held religious beliefs.” The opinion is patently false, dishonest, and knowingly and intentionally erroneous--and in violation of the United States Constitution as declared by the United States Supreme Court. For a Texas lawyer to engage in such conduct is a blatant violation of ethical duties under the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct.

Therefore, Paxton has violated the following Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct. The violations are as follows:

*R 1.06(b)(2): Paxton has a conflict of interest because his representation of his client (the State) is conflicted with his own self-interest in demagogic self-promotion to pander to his right-wing Tea Party supporters, even at the sacrifice of the rights of Texans under the United States Constitution.

*Rule 4.01(a): in representing his client (the State), Paxton has clearly made “false statement of law” to the public, in derogation of the fundamental Law of the Land, the United States Constitution.

*Rule 8.04(a)(1): in assisting and inducing Assistant Attorneys General to make knowingly false statements of fact and law in patently erroneous legal opinions that are flatly inconsistent with the United States Constitution, as declared by the United States Supreme Court.

*Rule 8.04(a)(3): in engaging in conduct involving deceit, dishonesty, and misrepresentation, in issuing the false and misleading opinion.

*Rule 8.04(a)(12): Mr. Paxton has violated the statutes setting out his official duties, including Government Code sections 402.041-402.042, by failing to issue an opinion setting out truthfully “the legal reasons and principles on which it is based.”

*Rules 8.04(a)(3), 8.04(a)(12): Finally, and most egregiously, Paxton violated his sworn oaths of office. Specifically, he violated the statutory oath that he took to become licensed to practice law in Texas. Section 82.037 of the Texas Government Code required Paxton to swear that he would “support the constitutions of the United States and this state.” He has violated both that oath and the United States Constitution. Additionally, Mr. Paxton violated his State Oath of Office, required under Article 16, Section 1, of the Texas Constitution, in which he stated that he “will faithfully execute the duties of the office of Attorney General the State of Texas, and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States and of this State, so help me God.”



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2015

The Honorable Dan Patrick
Lieutenant Governor of Texas
Post Office Box 12068
Austin, Texas 78711-2068

Opinion No. KP-0025

Re: Rights of government officials involved
with issuing same-sex marriage licenses and
conducting same-sex wedding ceremonies
(RQ-0031-KP)

Dear Governor Patrick:

On June 26, the United States Supreme Court held in *Obergefell v. Hodges* that there is now a constitutional right to same-sex marriage. No. 14-566 (2015). A federal district court for the Western District of Texas has now enjoined the State from enforcing Texas laws that define marriage as exclusively a union between one man and one woman. Before these events occurred, you asked whether—in the event the Texas definition of marriage is overturned—government officials such as employees of county clerks, justices of the peace, and judges may refuse to issue same-sex marriage licenses or conduct same-sex marriage ceremonies if doing so would violate their sincerely held religious beliefs.¹

In recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage, the Supreme Court acknowledged the continuing vitality of the religious liberties people continue to possess. *Id.*, slip op. at 27 (“[I]t must be emphasized that religions, and those who adhere to religious doctrines, may continue to advocate with utmost, sincere conviction that, by divine precepts, same-sex marriage should not be condoned.”). In recognizing a new constitutional right in 2015, the Supreme Court did not diminish, overrule, or call into question the rights of religious liberty that formed the first freedom in the Bill of Rights in 1791. This newly minted federal constitutional right to same-sex marriage can and should peaceably coexist with longstanding constitutional and statutory rights, including the rights to free exercise of religion and freedom of speech.

This opinion concludes:

- County clerks and their employees retain religious freedoms that may allow accommodation of their religious objections to issuing same-sex marriage licenses. The strength of any such claim depends on the particular facts of each case.

¹Letter from Honorable Dan Patrick, Lt. Gov., to Honorable Ken Paxton, Tex. Att’y Gen. at 1 (June 25, 2015), <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/opinion/requests-for-opinion-rqs>.

- Justices of the peace and judges similarly retain religious freedoms, and may claim that the government cannot force them to conduct same-sex wedding ceremonies over their religious objections, when other authorized individuals have no objection, because it is not the least restrictive means of the government ensuring the ceremonies occur. The strength of any such claim depends on the particular facts of each case.

I. County Clerks and Their Employees

Marriage licenses in Texas are issued by county clerks, and one may obtain a marriage license from any county clerk regardless of where the applicant resides. *See* TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 2.001(a) (West 2006) (“A man and a woman desiring to enter into a ceremonial marriage must obtain a marriage license from the county clerk of any county of this state.”). The Family Code provides that the “county clerk shall . . . execute the clerk’s certificate on the application” if the application complies with the statutory requirements. *Id.* § 2.008(a). But the county clerk may delegate this duty to others. Under the Local Government Code, a deputy clerk “may perform all official acts that the county clerk may perform.” TEX. LOC. GOV’T CODE ANN. § 82.005 (West 2008). Thus, under state law, a county clerk may delegate duties to deputy clerks, and deputy clerks have the authority but not the mandatory duty to perform the acts of the county clerk.²

With this background in mind, the question is whether a clerk or a clerk’s employees may refuse to issue a same-sex marriage license if doing so would violate their sincerely held religious beliefs. Such a question necessarily involves a variety of rights. The Supreme Court has now declared a right under the Fourteenth Amendment for same-sex couples to be married on the same terms as accorded to couples of the opposite sex. County clerks and their employees possess constitutional and statutory rights protecting their freedom of religion.³ And employees possess rights under state and federal law to be free from employment discrimination on the basis of religion.⁴ The statutory rights protecting freedom of religion are known as the Religious Freedom

²County clerks that fail to comply with the marriage license statute are subject to a fine of up to \$500. TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 2.102 (West 2006).

³*See* U.S. CONST. amend. I (“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .”); TEX. CONST. art. I, § 6 (“All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. . . . No human authority ought, in any case whatever, to control or interfere with the rights of conscience in matters of religion . . .”); 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(b) (2012) (only allowing a government to substantially burden a person’s religious exercise if the burden is the least restrictive means of furthering a compelling governmental interest); TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 110.003(b) (West 2011) (same).

⁴*See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-2(a), (m) (2012) (making it unlawful for an employer to discriminate against any individual with respect to his religion); TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 21.051 (West 2015) (same). Those laws exclude elected officials such as county clerks, justices of the peace, and judges from the definitions of “employee.” 42 U.S.C.

Restoration Acts and require the government to use the least restrictive means to further a compelling government interest when substantially burdening a person's free exercise of religion.⁵ Employment discrimination laws further provide that an employer must make a reasonable accommodation for an individual's religious beliefs or exercise so long as the accommodation does not impose an undue hardship on the employer.⁶

A county clerk has a statutory right to delegate a duty to a deputy clerk, including the issuance of same-sex marriage licenses that would violate the county clerk's sincerely held religious beliefs. Regarding deputy clerks and other employees, state and federal employment laws allow them to seek reasonable accommodation for a religious objection to issuing same-sex marriage licenses. And under the Religious Freedom Restoration Acts, deputy clerks and other employees may have a claim that forcing the employee to issue same-sex marriage licenses over their religious objections is not the government's least restrictive means of ensuring a marriage license is issued, particularly when available alternatives would not impose an undue burden on the individuals seeking a license. *See Slater v. Douglas Cnty.*, 743 F. Supp. 2d 1188, 1192–95 (D. Or. 2010) (refusing to grant summary judgment to a county that only offered to reassign an employee of a county clerk who refused on religious grounds to issue same-sex domestic partnership registrations rather than accommodating her request to not issue the registrations). Importantly, the strength of any claim under employment laws or the Religious Freedom Restoration Acts depends on the particular facts of each case.

Courts have balanced similar competing rights in other contexts, and I believe they would likely do so here.⁷ *See, e.g., Stormans Inc. v. Selecky*, 844 F. Supp. 2d 1172, 1188–93 (W.D. Wash. 2012) (holding that a state law mandating the issuance of drugs violated pharmacists' religious beliefs, and that refusing to issue the drugs and referring to another pharmacist was a sufficient practice); *Brady v. Dean*, 790 A.2d 428, 435 (Vt. 2001) (holding that a town clerk appointing an

§ 2000e-2(f) (2012); TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 21.002(7) (West 2015). But the constitutional protections and the Religious Freedom Restoration Acts have no such exemption.

⁵*See supra* note 3.

⁶42 U.S.C. § 2000e(j) (2012) (“The term ‘religion’ includes all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief, unless an employer demonstrates that he is unable to reasonably accommodate to an employee’s or prospective employee’s religious observance or practice without undue hardship on the conduct of the employer’s business.”); TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 21.108 (West 2015) (“A provision in this chapter referring to discrimination because of religion or on the basis of religion applies to discrimination because of or on the basis of any aspect of religious observance, practice, or belief, unless an employer demonstrates that the employer is unable reasonably to accommodate the religious observance or practice of an employee or applicant without undue hardship to the conduct of the employer’s business.”).

⁷Clerks and deputy clerks alike must take an oath of office. TEX. LOC. GOV'T CODE ANN. §§ 82.001(d), .005(b) (West 2008). And the oath requires the official to swear to “preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States and of this State, so help me God.” TEX. CONST. art. XVI, § 1. This oath does not change the above analysis because these officials are swearing to defend the same laws that both protect the newly-created constitutional right to same-sex marriage as well as the right to religious freedom. It would be curious indeed for an oath that ends with “so help me God” to mandate that the oath-taker set aside those very beliefs.

assistant clerk to issue same-sex marriage licenses did not impose a substantial burden on the town clerk's religious beliefs).

Factual situations may arise in which the county clerk seeks to delegate the issuance of same-sex marriage licenses due to a religious objection, but every employee also has a religious objection to participating in same-sex-marriage licensure. In that scenario, were a clerk to issue traditional marriage licenses while refusing to issue same-sex marriage licenses, it is conceivable that an applicant for a same-sex marriage license may claim a violation of the constitution.

If instead, a county clerk chooses to issue no marriage licenses at all, it raises at least two questions. First, a clerk opting to issue no licenses at all may find himself or herself in tension with the requirement under state law that a clerk "shall" issue marriage licenses to conforming applications. TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 2.008(a) (West 2006). A court must balance this statutory duty against the clerk's constitutional rights as well as statutory rights under the Religious Freedom Restoration Acts. Second, a court must also weigh the constitutional right of the applicant to obtain a same-sex marriage license. Such a factually specific inquiry is beyond the scope of what this opinion can answer.

In short, county clerks and their employees retain religious freedoms that may provide for certain accommodations of their religious objections to issuing same-sex marriage licenses—or issuing licenses at all, but the strength of any particular accommodation claim depends upon the facts.

II. Justices of the Peace and Judges

Texas law authorizes the following persons to conduct a marriage ceremony:

- (1) a licensed or ordained Christian minister or priest;
- (2) a Jewish rabbi;
- (3) a person who is an officer of a religious organization and who is authorized by the organization to conduct a marriage ceremony;
- (4) a justice of the supreme court, judge of the court of criminal appeals, justice of the courts of appeals, judge of the district, county, and probate courts, judge of the county courts at law, judge of the courts of domestic relations, judge of the juvenile courts, retired justice or judge of those courts, justice of the peace, retired justice of the peace, judge of a municipal court, retired judge of a municipal court, or judge or magistrate of a federal court of this state; and
- (5) a retired judge or magistrate of a federal court of this state.

TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 2.202(a) (West Supp. 2014). These individuals are *permitted* to perform any marriage ceremony, but nothing in Texas law *requires* them to do so. The Family Code

provides that, “[o]n receiving an unexpired marriage license, an authorized person *may* conduct the marriage ceremony as provided by this subchapter.” *Id.* § 2.203(a) (emphasis added). The only statutory restriction on their authority is that they are “prohibited from discriminating on the basis of *race, religion, or national origin* against an applicant who is otherwise competent to be married.” *Id.* § 2.205(a) (West 2006) (emphasis added).

Two aspects of this legal arrangement bear discussing. First, justices of the peace and judges are joined on the list of those authorized to conduct marriage ceremonies by four other types of persons not employed by state or local government. Second, as previous Attorney General opinions have demonstrated, judges and justices of the peace have no mandatory duty to conduct any wedding ceremony: “Although the Family Code authorizes justices of the peace and county judges, among others, to conduct a marriage ceremony, they are not required to exercise that authority”⁸ Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. GA-145 (2004) at 6 (citation omitted); *see also* Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. Nos. DM-397 (1996) at 1, JM-22 (1983) at 1, S-70 (1953) at 1.⁹ So long as other authorized individuals are willing to conduct same-sex wedding ceremonies, these statutory provisions demonstrate the practical reality that a refusal by a religiously objecting justice of the peace or judge cannot prevent a same-sex couple from participating in a wedding ceremony contemplated by state law. Under the Religious Freedom Restoration Acts, justices of the peace and judges may claim that the government forcing them to conduct a same-sex wedding ceremony over their religious objection, when other authorized individuals have no objection, is not the least restrictive means of the government ensuring that the ceremonies occur, assuming that is compelling governmental interest. Again, the strength of any such claim depends on the particular facts.¹⁰

⁸Under this second fact, justices of the peace and judges would be statutorily permitted to not conduct any wedding ceremonies.

⁹ These opinions built on the Texas Supreme Court’s principle that an official may keep a fee they charge that is not part of their mandatory official duty of office. *See, e.g., Moore v. Sheppard*, 192 S.W.2d 559, 560 (Tex. 1946) (“The general principle prohibiting public officials from charging fees for the performance of their official duties does not prohibit them from charging for their services for acts that they are under no obligation, under the law, to perform.”).

¹⁰Justices of the peace and judges likewise take an oath of office. But as explained in footnote 7, *supra*, this does not necessarily obviate their religious freedom in this context.

S U M M A R Y

County clerks and their employees retain religious freedoms that may provide accommodation of their religious objections to issuing same-sex marriage licenses. Justices of the peace and judges also may claim that the government forcing them to conduct same-sex wedding ceremonies over their religious objections, particularly when other authorized individuals have no objection to conducting such ceremonies, is not the least restrictive means of furthering any compelling governmental interest in ensuring that such ceremonies occur. Importantly, the strength of any particular religious-accommodation claim depends on the particular facts of each case.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ken Paxton". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

KEN PAXTON
Attorney General of Texas

CHARLES E. ROY
First Assistant Attorney General

BRANTLEY STARR
Deputy Attorney General for Legal Counsel

VIRGINIA K. HOELSCHER
Chair, Opinion Committee

Sunday, June 28, 2015

Attorney General Paxton: Religious Liberties of Texas Public Officials Remain Constitutionally Protected After *Obergefell v. Hodges*

Attorney General Ken Paxton today made the following statement and issued an opinion in response to questions about the impact of *Obergefell v. Hodges*, the case that redefined marriage:

“Friday, the United States Supreme Court again ignored the text and spirit of the Constitution to manufacture a right that simply does not exist. In so doing, the Court weakened itself and weakened the rule of law, but did nothing to weaken our resolve to protect religious liberty and return to democratic self-government in the face of judicial activists attempting to tell us how to live.

“Indeed, for those who respect the rule of law, this lawless ruling presents a fundamental dilemma: A ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court is considered the law of the land, but a judge-made edict that is not based in the law or the Constitution diminishes faith in our system of government and the rule of law.

“Now hundreds of Texas public officials are seeking guidance on how to implement what amounts to a lawless decision by an activist Court while adhering both to their respective faiths and their responsibility to uphold and defend the U.S. Constitution. Here is where things currently stand:

“Pursuant to the Court’s flawed ruling, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas issued an injunction against the enforcement of Texas marriage laws that define marriage as one man and one woman and therefore those laws currently are enjoined from being enforced by county clerks and justices of the peace. There is not, however, a court order in

“It is important to note that any clerk who wishes to defend their religious objections and who chooses not to issue licenses may well face litigation and/or a fine. But, numerous lawyers stand ready to assist clerks defending their religious beliefs, in many cases on a pro-bono basis, and I will do everything I can from this office to be a public voice for those standing in defense of their rights.

“Texas must speak with one voice against this lawlessness, and act on multiple levels to further protect religious liberties for all Texans, but most immediately do anything we can to help our County Clerks and public officials who now are forced with defending their religious beliefs against the Court’s ruling.”

To read Attorney General Paxton’s full opinion, [click here](#).

To read Attorney General Paxton’s earlier comments on this Supreme Court ruling, [click here](#).

From AG official website:

Attorney General Ken Paxton: Following High Court's Flawed Ruling, Next Fight is Religious Liberty

Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton today issued the following statement following the U.S. Supreme Court's flawed ruling on states' constitutional right to define marriage, stating the next fight is religious liberty:

"Today's ruling by five Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court marks a radical departure from countless generations of societal law and tradition. The impact of this opinion on our society and the familial fabric of our nation will be profound. Far from a victory for anyone, this is instead a dilution of marriage as a societal institution.

"What is most disturbing is the extent to which this opinion is yet another assault on the actual text of the U.S. Constitution and the rule of law itself. Just as *Roe v. Wade* ripped from the hands of the American people the issue of life and placed it in the judge-made 'penumbras' of the Constitution, so has this opinion made clear that our governing document – the protector of our liberties through representative government – can be molded to mean anything by unelected judges.

"But no court, no law, no rule, and no words will change the simple truth that marriage is the union of one man and one woman. Nothing will change the importance of a mother and a father to the raising of a child. And nothing will change our collective resolve that all Americans should be able to exercise their faith in their daily lives without infringement and harassment.

children and families they serve. Shortly, my office will be addressing questions about the religious liberties of clerks of court and justices of the peace.

“Displays of hate and intolerance against people of faith should be denounced by all people of good will and spark concern among anyone who believes in religious liberty and freedom for all.

“Despite this decision, I still have faith in America and the American people. We must be vigilant about our freedom and must use the democratic process to make sure America lives up to its promise as a land of freedom, religious tolerance and hope.”