

Christine Oldham

Mount San Antonio College

The Komikers have a solid basis for an effective argument opposing Texas' prohibition on same-sex marriage. As the United States Constitution guarantees certain basic rights to its citizens, and it being the "supreme law of the land," state constitutions must comply with, at that minimum, all rights guaranteed within the United States Constitution. Under the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause and both the Fifth and Fourteenth's due process clauses, the Komikers can argue their case for unconstitutionality of the provision to the Texas Constitution (Article 1, Section 32) which states that 'marriages can only be between men and women, and that same-sex marriages from other states will not be recognized.'

Since under choice of law, Texas accepted jurisdiction of the case by issuing a stay while awaiting the judgment from the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals for a similar case, it is now incumbent upon them to adjudicate it. I assume that the acceptance was based on "closest and most real connections" as the plaintiffs live in Texas and are arguing the denial of their rights under the United States Constitution in that state.

In any state, under the "Full Faith and Credit Clause" (Article IV, Section 1) of the United States Constitution, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, as a regularly practiced procedure by most court districts, should accept and recognize New York State's marriage laws. *"Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof."* If Texas chooses not to observe this norm of acceptance, the Komikers have more support for their veracity of their argument:

On June 26, 2013, in the *United States v. Windsor* 699 F 3d 1691, the United States Supreme Court held that the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), which was enacted September 21, 1996, was unconstitutional as stated by Clause 3: "The federal statute is invalid, for no legitimate purpose overcomes the purpose and effect to disparage and to injure those whom the State, by its marriage laws, sought to protect in personhood and dignity." As such, the United States State Department immediately started recognizing same-sex international marriages through the federal visa system. It can be argued that non-citizens should not have "more" rights than the citizens of the country into which they are trying to assimilate and in which they are trying to become citizens of. It is patently unfair and incongruous in juxtaposition to each other.

As a result of the holding in *Windsor*, even federal government departments commenced literally changing their views of by enacting and/or amending policies regarding benefits accorded same-sex couples and marriages. Social security, Medicaid, the IRS, and even the justice system have implemented changes to policies recognizing the validity of same-sex couples by allowing for benefits to the (same-sex) spouse. The current administration of our executive branch of government have opposed DOMA: in February 2011, the United States Attorney General, Eric Holder, along with President Obama announced their belief that the law was unconstitutional and that they would not longer defend it. With two branches of the federal government showing predominance of being, by policy and precedent against same-sex discrimination, it is only a matter of time before all legislative bans, restrictions, and discriminatory statutes are ruled unconstitutional.