



STATE OF FLORIDA

JAMES UTHMEIER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 4, 2025

Mr. Satya Nadella
Chief Executive Officer
Microsoft
1 Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052

Dear Mr. Nadella,

It appears that Microsoft is engaging in unlawful religious discrimination practices against certain nonprofit organizations. It must stop, and Microsoft's behavior must come into alignment with the very anti-discrimination policies it claims to champion.

On its website, Microsoft declares the company's position on inclusivity, providing that "[it] values and respects individual and cultural differences and is committed to providing an inclusive environment that is welcoming and free from discrimination."¹ Indeed, one of Microsoft's "Foundational principles" includes "[its] commitment to vulnerable groups":

We are committed to conducting business without discrimination based on race, color, ethnicity, sex, language, *religion, political or other opinion*, national or social origin, property, birth or other status such as disability, age, marital and family status, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, health status, place of residence, economic and social situation, or other characteristics, or the multiple intersecting forms of discrimination that influence the realization of human rights. (emphasis added).²

Lofty sentiments, but it appears that Microsoft applies these anti-discrimination policies in a discriminatory manner. Over the last few years, certain religiously affiliated nonprofits have been denied access to Microsoft's nonprofit discount program. These organizations—including private Christian schools, Christian churches, Christian nonprofits, and faith-based pregnancy resource centers—are present throughout the United States. Many call Florida home.

As part of its nonprofit program, Microsoft deems organizations ineligible if they have "a policy or mission of discrimination in ... training, programs, activities, and/or services based on race, color, sex, national origin, religion, age, disability, gender identity or expression, marital status,

¹ Microsoft, *Nonprofit Eligibility*, microsoft.com/en-us/nonprofits/eligibility#tab-non-discrimination (last visited November 4, 2025).

² Microsoft, *Microsoft Global Human Rights Statement*, microsoft.com/en-us/corporate-responsibility/human-rights-statement#tab-foundational-principles (last visited November 4, 2025).

pregnancy, sexual orientation, political affiliation, union membership, or veteran status.”³ Organizations wishing to participate in the nonprofit program must “[a]ttest to Microsoft’s anti-discrimination policy.”⁴ Yet as relevant here, Microsoft’s nonprofit program ostensibly exempts religiously affiliated organizations from this endorsement requirement, noting that its “anti-discrimination policies take guidance from your country’s exemptions for religious organizations.”⁵

On its face, then, Microsoft’s nonprofit program recognizes both Florida and federal law that protect against penalizing or prohibiting the free exercise of religion.⁶ In doing so, according to Microsoft’s own policies, these religiously affiliated nonprofits should be eligible for Microsoft’s nonprofit program. Microsoft, however, has quietly enacted some sort of tacit religious or ideological litmus test to determine institutions’ eligibility. This, of course, violates Florida’s Civil Rights Act.⁷

While many applicants weren’t given a reason for their denial, some were given the vague response that they allegedly fell outside of the “philanthropic scope” of Microsoft’s program. The exclusion of pregnancy resource centers was evidently based on these organizations not offering “full women’s health services” or, put plainly, abortions. Given the protections afforded to religiously affiliated institutions, and the lack of requirements that they must perform these procedures, we find this inconsistent with your own policy that states it will consider relevant exemptions for religious organizations.

In addition, other pregnancy resource centers were classified as “pregnancy centers” and therefore rendered ineligible for the discount program on that basis alone. Yet there is no such blanket restriction on organizations providing full-spectrum, life-focused health services to women facing unplanned pregnancies on your website. We find this both inconsistent with your non-discrimination policy and the claimed mission of the nonprofit program to support organizations that “have a mission to benefit the local community that could include but is not limited to - providing relief to the poor; advancing education; improving social welfare; preserving culture; preserving or restoring the environment; promoting human rights; establishment of civil society.”⁸

While Microsoft has reversed some past decisions based on such discriminatory judgments, it appears to have made no programmatic changes to prevent similar discrimination in the future. My office is committed to ensuring that consumers’ rights are protected from these sorts of deceptive and unfair business practices.⁹ Any “representation or omission” that is “likely to deceive a consumer acting reasonably in the same circumstances” constitutes an unfair trade

³ Microsoft, *Nonprofit Eligibility*, microsoft.com/en-us/nonprofits/eligibility#tab-non-discrimination (last visited November 4, 2025).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Microsoft, *Nonprofit Eligibility*, microsoft.com/en-us/nonprofits/eligibility#tab-organization (last visited November 4, 2025).

⁶ *See, e.g.*, § 390.0111(8), Fla. Stat. (providing that a hospital, or person associated with a hospital, may refuse to participate in an abortion on religious grounds and there shall be no disciplinary actions against them for refusing); § 760.10(10), Fla. Stat. (permitting religious institutions to give preference in employment to individuals who hold those religious beliefs and carry out work in association with the religious institution); § 761.061, Fla. Stat. (stating that religious organizations or certain individuals employed by those organizations may refuse to solemnize a marriage or related services if the action violates a sincerely held religious belief).

⁷ § 760.021, Fla. Stat.

⁸ Microsoft, *Nonprofit Eligibility*, microsoft.com/en-us/nonprofits/eligibility#tab-mission (last visited November 4, 2025).

⁹ *See* § 501.202(2), Fla. Stat.

practice.¹⁰ “[A]n advertisement is considered deceptive if it has the capacity to convey misleading impressions to consumers even though nonmisleading interpretations may be possible.”¹¹ The promise of discounts for seemingly qualifying non-profits, only to be denied because of unstated religious and ideological biases, violates these protections.

If Microsoft is pro-abortion and hostile to the pro-life community, then make that position plain. If Microsoft harbors some hostility to Christian educational institutions, then come out and say it. Don’t hide anti-life and anti-Christian biases behind a mellifluous nondiscrimination policy that suggests an all-comers policy to the nonprofit community.

In Florida, this sort of anti-religious, anti-conservative, and anti-consumer discrimination is intolerable. I therefore urge Microsoft to stop its religious discrimination and begin adhering to its own non-discriminatory commitments. Or at minimum, Microsoft should drop its “inclusive” pretense and publicly admit its hostility to Christian non-profits and pro-life pregnancy resource centers. The choice is yours, but the status quo is dishonest and illegal.

Sincerely,



James Uthmeier
Attorney General

¹⁰ *Davis v. Powertel, Inc.*, 776 So. 2d 971, 974 (Fla. 1st DCA 2000).

¹¹ *Dep’t of Legal Affs. v. Father & Son Moving & Storage, Inc.*, 643 So. 2d 22, 26 (Fla. 4th DCA 1994) (citing *Chrysler Corp. v. F.T.C.*, 561 F.2d 357 (D.C. Cir. 1977)).