

State →	RFRA →	RFRA-Like Protections Via State Court Decision(s) →	No RFRA-Like Protections Exist (either by statute or by state court decision(s))
Alabama	Yes— <i>Ala. Const. Art. I, Sec. 3.01</i> (1998).		
Alaska	No.	Several court decisions indicate judicial scrutiny exists for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
Arizona	Yes— <i>A.R.S. § 41-1493.01</i> (1999).		
Arkansas	Yes— <i>A.C.A. § 16-123-401 et. seq.</i> (2015).		
California	No.	No.	Yes.
Colorado	No.	Several court decisions indicate judicial scrutiny exists for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
Connecticut	Yes— <i>Conn. Gen. Stat. § 52-571b</i> (1993).		
Delaware	No.	No.	Yes.
Florida	Yes— <i>Fla. Stat. § 761.03</i> (1998).		
Georgia	No.	No.	Yes.
Hawaii	No.	No.	Yes.
Idaho	Yes— <i>Idaho Code § 73-402</i> (2000).		
Illinois	Yes— <i>775 ILCS § 35/15</i> (1998).		
Indiana	Yes— <i>Indiana Code § 34-13-9-8</i> (2015), but note possible restrictions.		
Iowa	No.	No.	Yes.
Kansas	Yes— <i>Kan. Stat. Ann. § 60-5303</i> (2013).		
Kentucky	Yes— <i>Ky. Rev. Stat. § 446.350</i> (2013).		
Louisiana	Yes— <i>La. Rev. Stat. § 13:5233</i> (2010).		
Maine	No.	A 2006 state supreme court decision indicates judicial scrutiny for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
Maryland	No.	No.	Yes.
Massachusetts	No.	A 1994 state supreme court decision indicates judicial scrutiny for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
Michigan	No.	Yes—court decisions suggest RFRA-like protections possible for churches.	
Minnesota	No.	Yes—court decisions suggest RFRA-like protections possible for churches.	
Mississippi	Yes— <i>Miss. Code §11-61-1</i> (2014).		
Missouri	Yes— <i>R.S.Mo. § 1.302</i> (2003).		

State →	RFRA →	RFRA-Like Protections Via State Court Decision(s) →	No RFRA-Like Protections Exist (either by statute or by state court decision(s))
Montana	Yes— <i>MCA §27-33-105</i> (2021).	A 2004 state supreme court decision indicated judicial scrutiny for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) would be more likely to prevail). The passage of a RFRA in 2021 superseded this ruling.	
Nebraska	No.	No.	Yes.
Nevada	No.	No.	Yes.
New Hampshire	No.	A 2010 state supreme court decision indicates judicial scrutiny for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
New Jersey	No.	A 1997 state supreme court decision indicates judicial scrutiny for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
New Mexico	Yes— <i>N.M. Stat. § 28-22-3</i> (2000). But a state supreme court decision emphasized the state RFRA does not apply to lawsuits brought by private parties.		
New York	No.	A 2006 state supreme court decision indicates judicial scrutiny for burdens on religious exercise, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
North Carolina	No.	A 2006 state appellate court decision indicates judicial scrutiny for burdens on religious exercise exists, but at a lesser standard than the federal RFRA (meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail).	
North Dakota	Yes— <i>N.D. Cent. Code, § 14-02.4-08.1</i> (2023)		
Ohio	No.	Yes—a state supreme court decision says RFRA-like protections possible for churches.	
Oklahoma	Yes— <i>Okla. Stat. tit. 51, § 253</i> (2000).		
Oregon	No.	No.	Yes.
Pennsylvania	Yes— <i>Pa. Stat. tit. 71, § 2404</i> (2002).		
Rhode Island	Yes— <i>R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-80.1-3</i> (1993).		
South Carolina	Yes— <i>S.C. Code § 1-32-40</i> (1999).		
South Dakota	Yes— <i>S.D. Codified Laws §1-1A-4</i> (2021).		
Tennessee	Yes— <i>Tenn. Code § 4-1-407</i> (2009).		
Texas	Yes— <i>Tex. Civ. Prac. & Remedies Code §110.001</i> (1999).		
Utah	The “Utah Religious Land Use Act,” <i>Utah Code Ann. § 63L-5-101 et seq.</i> (2005).		
Vermont	No.	No.	Yes.

State →	RFRA →	RFRA-Like Protections Via State Court Decision(s) →	No RFRA-Like Protections Exist (either by statute or by state court decision(s))
Virginia	Yes— <i>Va. Code Ann. § 57-2.02(B)</i> (1786).		
Washington	No.	No.	Yes.
West Virginia	Yes— <i>W. Va. Code § 35-1A-1</i> (2023)		
Wisconsin	No.	Yes—a 2009 state supreme court decision suggests RFRA-like protections possible for churches.	
Wyoming	No.	No.	Uncertainty—a 2017 state supreme court decision indicates lesser judicial scrutiny, meaning state action (such as the existence of a law or its enforcement) is more likely to prevail. However, the court retained the flexibility to apply a higher standard in the future if it wishes.
District of Columbia	No.	Uncertainty—a 1987 court decision suggests a party that successfully shows their free exercise rights have been violated by government action shifts the burden to the government to show a compelling state interest exists. If the government successfully shows a compelling state interest, the court then must ensure the interest is advanced in the least-restrictive manner necessary.	
Federal	Yes— <i>42 USCS § 2000bb</i> (1993). However, it applies only to federal government laws and actions (per <i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i> , 521 U.S. 507 (1997)).	N/A	N/A