

Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act

July 18, 2013

by [Randy Bright](#)



Randy Bright

A year ago we heard the disappointing decision by the US Supreme Court regarding the individual mandate to purchase insurance under Obamacare.

Last year, Hobby Lobby filed suit against the federal government over the requirement to provide contraception and abortions imposed by Obamacare. In U.S. history, never have rights and religious rights of the American people been under greater assault than they are now. And while most of us are hopeful that it will be overturned and that Obamacare will be completely repealed, there is no assurance that it will.

Two years ago, religious rights were under assault by Boulder County, Colorado, when they took Rocky Mountain Christian Church to the U.S. Supreme Court, hoping that the court would overturn every previous court that had held that the church's rights had been violated under the Constitution and RLUIPA, the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act.

Fortunately, the court refused to hear the case. I say fortunately because I believe that there would have been a good chance that it could have led to RLUIPA's demise, given the increasing population of liberal judges on the bench.

RLUIPA has been instrumental in protecting the rights of numerous churches since its passage in 2000. Its main purpose was to protect churches from abuse by municipalities that used zoning codes and procedures to impede or prevent churches from exercising their rights to use their property, including the construction of new facilities.

RLUIPA is not a term that the general public hears every day, and comparatively few people even know of its existence. That's unfortunate, given that it is the most important law (aside from the Constitution itself) that churches can rely upon to protect themselves from cities or counties that use zoning as a weapon against them.

RLUIPA was enacted after an earlier law, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) of 1993, was declared unconstitutional by the 1997 Supreme Court case of *City of Boerne v. Flores*.

In that case, the city had refused a permit for the expansion of a church in an historic district, and the Court ruled Congress was only empowered to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment (due process and equal protection of the law), and that specific treatment of religion had not been identified in the RFRA.

RLUIPA was more specific, stating that “no government shall impose or implement a land use regulation in a manner that imposes a substantial burden on the religious exercise of a person, including a religious assembly or institution, unless the government demonstrates that imposition of the burden on that person, assembly, or institution (A) is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest; and (B) is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling interest.”

As such, RLUIPA prohibits a church from receiving less favorable treatment than other institutions. It also prohibits banning churches from any jurisdiction, or from imposing unreasonable requirements on churches.

The constitutionality of the land use portion of the RLUIPA has still not been confirmed by the Supreme Court, but it has been upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and by the majority of the lower district courts.

Passage of RLUIPA was timely, because only a few years later the U.S. Supreme Court essentially gave carte blanche to municipalities to take property, using eminent domain, that it deemed necessary for economic purposes.

Since then, churches have come under increased risk for taking because of their tax-exempt status. Had the Court taken the Rocky Mountain Christian Church case, and had they ruled in favor of Boulder County instead of the church, I believe it would have significantly weakened RLUIPA if it would not eliminate it completely.

The outcome of the individual mandate in Obamacare and the recent favorable court decision for Hobby Lobby are critical to the long-term religious rights of all Americans. But if the individual mandate is ultimately upheld, it will signal to the federal government that it can impose any thing it wishes upon the public, and it will tell the federal government that it can force Christians and churches to act against their religious beliefs and their consciences.

The importance of these two cases cannot be understated. A bad outcome may well be the beginning of an all-out political war against Christianity in America.

©2013 Randy W. Bright

Randy W. Bright, AIA, NCARB, is an architect who specializes in church and church-related projects. You may contact him at 918-582-3972, rwbrightchurcharch@sbcglobal.net or www.churcharchitect.net.

© 2013 Tulsa Beacon