PRESS ANNOUNCEMENT
US Supreme Court landmark case as it affects Nevada school Districts
(including WCSD)

From: WatchDogJeff.com

On June 27th the US Supreme Court issued a landmark decision on religious rights as it relates to schools actively promoting LGBT+ rights. The court ruled in favor of religious rights.

This is not surprising as various laws and the Nevada Constitution recognize: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by this State or any of its political subdivisions on account of race, color, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, disability, ancestry or national origin." And "That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of said state shall ever be molested, in person or property, on account of his or her mode of religious worship." Yet the creed- religion part seems to have been ignored.

Essentially the Court indicated the right of parents/ guardian to Opt-Out of any LGBTQ+ education or indoctrination stating in part (see below) "We have long recognized the rights of parents to direct 'the religious upbringing' of their children." …And we have held that those rights are violated by government policies that "substantially interfere with the religious development of children".

The Supreme Court correctly pointed out too that "education is compulsory … They have an obligation—enforceable by fine or imprisonment…"

To that end I ask the media to reach out to WCSD, the State Department of Education, and other school districts to see if they plan to offer such Opt-Out to parents.

---

I note that the Washoe County School District (WCSD) has formal policies on such issues that may be perceived as in conflict. That includes withholding a student's gender identity from parents, requiring use of the students pronouns and essentially requiring acceptance of sexual orientation including the District policy to actively promote such environments. WCSD offers various other Opt-In or Opt-out options but not this.

*This is not construed to be anti-sexual orientation or pro-religion but schools should educate not indoctrinate and do so on an equal basis with all protected classes and that certainly does include religious rights.

I also point out that WCSD "Administrative Regulation 6144.1 Recognition of Religious Beliefs and Customs" was last reviewed in 1992and includes, "Instead, the school district should encourage all students and staff members to appreciate and be tolerant of each other's religious views. The school district should utilize its opportunity to foster understanding and mutual respect among students and parent(s) or guardian(s), whether it involves race, culture, economic background or religious beliefs. In that spirit of tolerance, **students and staff members should be excused from participating in practices which are contrary to their religious beliefs** unless there are clear issues of overriding concern that would prevent it."

WCSD Policy 5161 includes:
Staff shall not disclose information that may reveal a student's transgender or gender non-conforming status to others, including parents/guardians or other staff members, unless there is a specific Administrative Regulation 5161 Gender Identity and Gender Non-Conformity - Students Page 2 "need to know," they are legally required to do so, or the student has authorized such disclosure.

Names/Pronouns – Students have the right to be addressed by the names and pronouns that correspond to their gender identity
*Are student required to so address others?

BOARD POLICY 9210 EQUITY AND DIVERSITY
"Diversity and Inclusion" is diversity that embodies acceptance and respect for a range of differences among people, cultures, and perspectives Inclusion means that the diverse groups are represented and included in all sectors of the organization and organizational life. Diversity and diverse populations may include but are not limited to: Race and ethnicity; gender; gender identity/expression; sexual orientation; ability/disability status; religion and spirituality; age; education; socio-economic status; language/communication modality; individual experiential backgrounds; lifestyle (interests, hobbies, activities, affiliations); family dynamics; and any other protected class in conformance with federal, state, and local laws. "

Policy 9215:also address "sexual orientation" Through these commitments, the District expresses its goal to actively cultivate and promote safe, orderly, and respectful environments to ensure equitable opportunities for all students to learn, employees to work to optimal capacity, and families to participate as partners in education. To that end, structures, systems, policies, and procedures shall be implemented and maintained based on a positive, productive culture of meaningful, collaborative relationships focused on student achievement.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: MAHMOUD ET AL. v. TAYLOR ET AL.
CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
No. 24-297. Argued April 22, 2025—Decided June 27, 2025 (edited)

(2) The Board's introduction of the "LGBTQ+-inclusive" storybooks, combined with its decision to withhold notice to parents and to forbid opt outs, substantially interferes with the religious development of petitioners' children and imposes the kind of burden on religious exercise that Yoder found unacceptable. The books are unmistakably normative. They are designed to present certain values and beliefs as things to be celebrated, and certain contrary values and beliefs as things to be rejected.

The storybooks similarly convey a normative message on the subjects of sex and gender. Many Americans, like the parents in this case, believe that biological sex reflects divine creation, that sex and gender are inseparable, and that children should be encouraged to accept their sex and to live accordingly. The storybooks, however, suggest that it is hurtful, and perhaps even hateful, to hold the view that gender is inextricably bound with biological sex.

(1) The Court does not accept the Board's characterizations of the "LGBTQ+-inclusive" instruction as mere "exposure to objectionable ideas" or as lessons in "mutual respect." The storybooks unmistakably convey a particular viewpoint about same-sex marriage and gender.

(5) It is no answer that parents remain free to place their children in private school or to educate them at home. Public education is a public benefit, and the government cannot "condition" its

"availability" on parents' willingness to accept a burden on their religious exercise. Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer, 582 U. S. 449, 462. Moreover, given that education is compulsory in Maryland, the parents are not being asked simply to forgo a public benefit. They have an obligation—enforceable by fine or imprisonment—to send their children to public school unless they find an adequate substitute they can afford. §§7-301(a)(3), (e).

A government burdens the religious exercise of parents when it requires them to submit their children to instruction that poses "a very real threat of undermining" the religious beliefs and practices that the parents wish to instill. Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U. S. 205, 218 (1972). And a government cannot condition the benefit of free public education on parents' acceptance of such instruction. Based on these principles, we conclude that the parents are likely to succeed in their challenge to the Board's policies.

**To begin, we hold that the parents are likely to succeed on their claim that the Board's policies unconstitutionally burden their religious exercise. "[W]e have long recognized the rights of parents to direct 'the religious upbringing' of their children." …And we have held that those rights are violated by government policies that "substantially interfer[e] with the religious development" of children. Id., at 218. Such interference, we have observed, "carries with it precisely the kind of objective danger to the free exercise of religion that the First Amendment was designed to prevent." Ibid. For the reasons explained below, we conclude that such an "objective danger" is present here.**

In light of the record before us, we hold that the Board's introduction of the "LGBTQ+-inclusive" storybooks—combined with its decision to withhold notice to parents and to forbid opt outs—substantially interferes with the religious development of their children and imposes the kind of burden on religious exercise that Yoder found unacceptable.

Books include: Prince & Knight, Prince & Knight, Born Ready: The True Story of a Boy Named Penelope.