Navigating the New Legal Landscape: Pursuit of Inclusivity and Belonging in an Evolving DEI Framework

Author: Kenneth E. Sharperson
Firm: Armstrong Teasdale LLP
Address: 400 Park Avenue, New York, NY

Introduction

Recent judicial decisions and executive actions have significantly narrowed the permissible scope of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) initiatives. Legal and diversity professionals now face the pressing question: how can these objectives be pursued within the bounds of the current legal framework? Despite these developments, the foundational principles of DEIB—equal access and opportunity—remain imperative to institutional and societal equity. This program will a comprehensive analysis of U.S. case law, international obligations, and practical strategies for compliance and advancement of inclusivity goals.

I. U.S. Legal Framework and Key Judicial Decisions

The Supreme Court's decision in *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*[1] marked a pivotal shift, declaring race-conscious admissions unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause. While primarily impacting higher education, its reasoning has influenced corporate DEI programs, prompting reverse discrimination suits under Section 1981 and Title VII. Concurrently, Executive Orders 14151 and 14173[2] terminated federal DEI programs and rescinded affirmative action mandates for contractors, signaling heightened scrutiny of private-sector initiatives.

A. Section 1981 Litigation and Reverse Discrimination Claims

Comcast Corp. v. NAAAOM[3] clarified that §1981 requires but-for causation throughout the life of a case, raising the pleading and proof bar. Recent cases such as *American Alliance for Equal Rights v. Fearless Fund*[4] applied §1981 to race-restricted grant contests, resulting in injunctions where eligibility turned on race. *Correll v. Amazon*[5] dismissed claims lacking a concrete contractual relationship, underscoring standing requirements.

B. Title VII Developments

---

1 600 U.S. 181 (2023).
2 Exec. Order No. 14151, Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs (2025).
3 No. 18-1171, 589 U.S. ___ (2020).
4 103 F.4th 765 (11th Cir. 2024).
5 2023 WL 6131080 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 19, 2023).

Ricci v. DeStefano[6] held that discarding test results to avoid disparate impact liability constitutes disparate treatment absent a strong basis in evidence. *Muldrow v. City of St. Louis*[7] lowered the adverse-action threshold for discriminatory transfers, requiring only some harm to terms or conditions. *Groff v. DeJoy*[8] heightened the standard for denying religious accommodations, requiring substantial increased costs. *Bostock v. Clayton County* (2020)[9] confirmed Title VII protects sexual orientation and gender identity.

C. Board Diversity Mandates

California's SB 826 and AB 979 were struck down under the California Constitution and federal challenges, signaling constitutional limits on quota-like mandates.[10] Companies should pivot to disclosure-based approaches aligned with investor expectations.

II. State-Level Anti-DEI Legislation

As of 2025, over 22 states have enacted laws restricting DEI practices in public institutions, including bans on mandatory diversity training and DEI offices (e.g., Florida HB 999, Texas SB 17). These measures create compliance challenges for organizations operating across multiple jurisdictions.

III. International ESG and DEI Compliance

Global employers must reconcile U.S. restrictions with international mandates such as the EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)[11] and the UK Equality Act 2010.[12] CSRD requires detailed workforce diversity disclosures under ESRS S1, gender pay gap reporting, and integration of DEI into ESG strategies. Non-compliance risks include regulatory penalties and reputational harm.

IV. Practical Strategies for Advancing Inclusivity

Organizations should pivot from quota-based approaches to barrier-removal strategies, emphasizing inclusive culture without explicit preferences. Recommended actions include:

- Conducting legal risk assessments for DEI programs
- Aligning DEI initiatives with ESG reporting obligations
- Implementing governance frameworks for policy adaptation

---

6 557 U.S. 557 (2009).
7 144 S. Ct. 967 (2024)
8 600 U.S. 447 (2023).
9 590 U.S. 644 (2020).
10 *Crest v. Padilla* (Cal. Super. Ct. 2022); *Alliance for Fair Board Recruitment v. Weber*, No. 2:21-cv-01951 (E.D. Cal. 2023).
11 EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (Directive (EU) 2022/2464).
12 UK Equality Act 2010.

- Training leadership on lawful DEI practices under Title VII and international standards
- Documenting business necessity for selection criteria and evaluating less-disparate alternatives
- Building religious accommodation workflows post-Groff decision
- Integrating Bostock protections into policies and benefits

V. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Considerations

Attorneys advising on DEI must navigate conflicts between client objectives and evolving anti-discrimination laws. Ethical duties under ABA Model Rules 1.2 and 2.1 require candid advice on legal risks while promoting compliance with civil rights statutes. Lawyers should avoid facilitating unlawful preferences and ensure transparency in ESG and DEI reporting.