

**PUBLICATION OF REDACTED VERSION**  
**OF THE OEIG FOR THE ILLINOIS SECRETARY OF STATE**  
**INVESTIGATIVE REPORT**

Case # 21-0098

Subject(s): Bruce Sutchar

Below is the redacted version of an investigative summary report from the Executive Inspector General for the Secretary of State of Illinois. The General Assembly directed the Executive Inspector General to deliver to the Executive Ethics Commission (Commission) a copy of the investigation's summary report and response from the ultimate jurisdictional authority or agency head. 5 ILCS 430/20-50(c-5). The General Assembly also directed the Commission to redact information from this report that may reveal the identity of witnesses, complainants, or informants and "any other information it believes should not be made public." 5 ILCS 430/20-52(b). Furthermore, the General Assembly directed the Commission to make available to the public the redacted investigative report and response. 5 ILCS 430/20-52(a) & (b). By publishing the below redacted summary report, the Commission neither makes nor adopts any findings of fact or conclusions of law for or against any individual or entity referenced therein.

The Commission exercises its publication responsibility with great caution and seeks to balance the sometimes-competing interests of transparency and fairness to the accused and others uninvolved. To balance these interests, the Commission may redact certain information contained in this report and identify where said redactions have taken place. Additionally, the Commission may redact certain information relating to unfounded allegations. Redactions of allegations against a person who was found not to have committed a violation are made with the understanding that the subject or subjects of the investigation have not had the opportunity to rebut the report's factual allegations or legal conclusions before the Commission because this publication is only the result of the Executive Inspector General's investigation and not the result of an adjudication before the Commission.

The Commission received this report and a response from the ultimate jurisdictional authority and/or agency in this matter from the Secretary of State's Office of Executive Inspector General ("OEIG"). The Commission, pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52, redacted the OEIG's final report and responses and mailed copies of the redacted version and responses to the Attorney General, the Executive Inspector General for the Secretary of State, and the subject(s) last known addresses.

The Commission reviewed all suggestions received and makes this document available pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52.

**OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE INSPECTOR GENERAL**  
**FOR THE SECRETARY OF STATE**  
**AMENDED INVESTIGATIVE REPORT**

In Re: Bruce Sutchar, Public Service Representative  
Case Number: 21-0098  
Date of Report: April 29, 2022

This investigation by the Office of the Executive Inspector General (OEIG) has resulted in a determination that reasonable cause exists to believe that a violation has occurred, and this summary report is issued in compliance with 5 ILCS 430/20-50(a).

**I. Allegations**

On December 7, 2021, [identifying information redacted] [SOS Employee 1] alleged that probationary Intermittent Public Service Representative Bruce Sutchar patted her on the buttock as she walked past him inside her office at the Lombard facility. [SOS Employee 1] subsequently reported Sutchar to facility management and, on December 8, 2021, the Department of Personnel submitted statements that had been collected from the involved parties to the OEIG for further investigation.

**II. Investigation**

On January 23, 2022, Inspector Raynor conducted an interview with [SOS Employee 1] during which she was shown a copy of her December 7, 2021, written statement regarding the incident. According to [SOS Employee 1]’s written statement:

Today at about 3:15 PM I left my office for a few minutes and come [sic] back into my office and a new hire by the name of Bruce, was standing in my office taking candy that I have put out for anyone to have and when I walked past him, he proceeded to give my [sic] a “pat” on my behind. This “pat” was not wanted in anyway and I was shocked and very embarrassed. I was not aware that this “pat” on my behind was witnessed by anyone else, and I am so very glad it was, so it doesn’t become a “I say-he say” situation. The person that witnessed this is one of the [identifying information redacted] by the name of [SOS Employee 2] and he said he would be happy to verify this. I am not sure why Bruce left his assigned work station because he was not on break. I have a clear view of where he is being trained which is at the information station. This “pat” on my behind was

unwanted/unsolicited and I feel violated. I hope by me sending in this complaint, that Bruce does not get away with such behavior [sic] and hopefully he realizes that this is harassment and unacceptable and I am so upset by this I can not even think clearly while typing this. Any help in this matter will be greatly appreciated, and hopefully he does not do this to anyone else. Thank you for your time. Gratefully [SOS Employee 1] [identifying information redacted] Lombard Facility

[SOS Employee 1] confirmed the accuracy of this statement during the interview. Further, [SOS Employee 1] indicated that she had no changes or additions to make to the statement. Upon being questioned further about the incident, [SOS Employee 1] recalled that when she returned from having left her office momentarily, she had found Sutchar standing inside in front of a small table near her desk where she had a bowl of candy for anyone to take. [SOS Employee 1] said she did not think Sutchar was on a break because she had just seen him working at the information counter. [SOS Employee 1] said she greeted Sutchar momentarily and walked around him to return to her chair, at which time Sutchar patted her on the buttock with his hand. [SOS Employee 1] said that Sutchar's behavior was unwarranted and unwelcome and had caused her to feel violated. She said she sat down and looked at Sutchar in disbelief and he just smiled at her. She said he then took a handful of candy from the bowl and left the room. [SOS Employee 1] stated that she was shocked and humiliated by what Sutchar had done and sat there at her desk frozen for a moment. [SOS Employee 1] was still sitting at her desk moments later when [SOS Employee 2] stepped inside her office and told her that he had seen what happened and asked if she was OK. [SOS Employee 1] said that she had seen [SOS Employee 2] standing just outside her doorway prior to the incident. [SOS Employee 1] said she subsequently reported Sutchar's conduct to [identifying information redacted]/[identifying information redacted] [SOS Employee 3]. When asked what her relationship to Sutchar had been prior to the incident, [SOS Employee 1] advised that Sutchar had just started working at the facility in November and said she had only spoken to him in passing a few times before the incident.

On January 25, 2022, Inspector Raynor conducted an interview with [identifying information redacted] [SOS Employee 2] during which he was shown a copy of his December 7, 2021, written statement regarding the incident. According to [SOS Employee 2]'s written statement:

I, [SOS Employee 2], at about 3:15 PM witnessed Bruce walking into [SOS Employee 1]'s office to get candy which she has out for whoever likes it. At 3:17 PM [SOS Employee 1] walked into her office and when she walked past Bruce trying to get by him, he proceeded to pat her on the behind and trying [sic] to make conversation. [SOS Employee 1] appeared shocked and upset by his actions. I approached [SOS Employee 1] to see if she was OK. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me here at the Lombard facility. Thank you. Sincerely, [SOS Employee 2] [identifying information redacted]

[SOS Employee 2] confirmed the accuracy of this statement during the interview. [SOS Employee 2] also indicated that he had no changes or additions to make to the statement. During the interview, [SOS Employee 2] recalled that Sutchar had left the room after patting [SOS Employee 1] on the buttock with his hand and [SOS Employee 1] had just sat at her desk looking “horrified.” [SOS Employee 2] said he went inside the office to see if [SOS Employee 1] was OK and told her that he had witnessed what Sutchar had done and urged her to report the inappropriate conduct.

On February 9, 2022, Inspector Raynor, accompanied by Inspector Anthony Kalant, conducted an interview with Bruce Sutchar at the OEIG office in Oak Brook, Illinois. [identifying information redacted] [Union Representative 1] also attended the meeting. At the outset of the interview, Sutchar acknowledged his understanding of the requirement to answer questions truthfully and completely in accordance with SOS Policy 1.1.8 Official Investigations. Upon explanation that [SOS Employee 1] had alleged he had patted her on her buttock on December 7, Sutchar said he was familiar with [SOS Employee 1]’s allegation. Sutchar then denied the allegations and contended that [SOS Employee 1] was lying. When asked why he had gone to [SOS Employee 1]’s office on December 7, Sutchar said he went there to get candy from a bowl that [SOS Employee 1] keeps in her office. Sutchar told inspectors [SOS Employee 1] was already seated at her desk when he entered the room and vowed that he would not have gone into her office unless she was present. When Sutchar was asked if [SOS Employee 1] had walked past him at any time while he was in her office, Sutchar said “No.” Inspector Raynor asked why [SOS Employee 1] would fabricate the allegation against him and Sutchar responded that he did not know. Sutchar said that [SOS Employee 1] had previously told him “her life story” which he claimed had included the fact that she was single. When Sutchar was informed that there had been a witness who saw him pat [SOS Employee 1] on her buttock, Sutchar said the witness was also lying and demanded to know the name of the witness. Sutchar was advised that the name of the witness would not be disclosed.

When asked whether he had ever been accused of inappropriate sexual behavior in the past, Sutchar said “No” and affirmed he had “never been accused of anything like this in all the years he had spent in public service.”

Sutchar was asked if he had received Sexual Harassment and Ethics training since coming to work at the Secretary of State last November. He replied “Yes.” Inspector Raynor subsequently reviewed signed acknowledgement forms from the Department of Personnel confirming that Sutchar had indeed received Ethics Training on November 2 and had undergone Sexual Harassment training on November 4, 2021. Sutchar also acknowledged that he was aware that patting a co-worker on the buttocks was a form of sexual harassment and was thereby prohibited by SOS policy.

Sutchar was presented with a copy of his written statement submitted to the facility manager at the time of [SOS Employee 1]’s complaint and asked if he would like to make any revisions to it. The written statement reads as follows: “12/8/21 I am accused of patting [SOS Employee 1] on 12/7/21 when I went into her office to get a piece of candy. No matter how many witnesses I never touched her whatsoever. Sincerely, Bruce Sutchar #[employee identification number redacted]”. Sutchar requested the opportunity to submit a supplemental statement via email at a later time. Sutchar emailed the following statement on February 9 after the interview had concluded:

[SOS Employee 1]’s accusations have totally blind-sided me. I have absolutely no recollection of the incident that she has accused me of whatsoever. I have taught elementary school and driven school busses and have NEVER had any accusation like this in my 74+ years of public service. I have been good friends with Secretary of State Jesse White for the past 35 years (although I am sure that this is totally irrelevant at this moment- other than having him serve as a character witness). Other than my original statement of absolute denial of the incident, I do not care to change my response whatsoever. In my defense, I would like to add that I have been working everyday with [SOS Employee 4] at the DMV. [SOS Employee 4] is my immediate instructor, teaching me how to do my job. In this respect. [sic] We sit next to each other, basically from 11-3:30 every day. She could certainly be an excellent character witness as she observes my complete behavior every day for 3 ½ hours. I have no idea why [SOS Employee 1] would make this false accusation. We have always had a “friendly” interaction whenever I came to her office to have some candy. I am usually in her office for about 15 seconds. She is always sitting behind her big desk when we talk. Again, I have absolutely no recollection of the incident as she says it happens. I have never seen her outside of her office and I would never enter her office if she were not present. Sincerely,

A review of the facility video surveillance obtained from the Illinois Secretary of State Police showed that [SOS Employee 1] left her office on December 7 at 15:13:12. Sutchar can then be seen leaving the Information Counter and walking directly toward [SOS Employee 1]’s office at 15:13:46. The footage then showed that [SOS Employee 1] returned to her office at 15:13:57. [SOS Employee 2] can be observed standing near the doorway to [SOS Employee 1]’s office at 15:15:51. Sutchar was seen leaving [SOS Employee 1]’s office at 15:17:27.

### **III. [Determinations]& Recommendation**

[The information in this paragraph is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined that reasonable cause did not exist to believe a violation of law or policy had occurred or that there had been fraud, waste, mismanagement, misconduct, nonfeasance,

misfeasance, or malfeasance. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this subsection pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52.]<sup>1 2</sup>

[The information in this paragraph is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined that reasonable cause did not exist to believe a violation of law or policy had occurred or that there had been fraud, waste, mismanagement, misconduct, nonfeasance, misfeasance, or malfeasance. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this subsection pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52.]<sup>3 4 5</sup>

However, this investigation has also resulted in a determination that reasonable cause exists to believe that one or more violations has occurred. [Sutchar's conduct implicates] the following SOS policy manual provisions: Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 1: Courtesy, paragraph 1.1.1(a) by failing to treat another employee with equal dignity; Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 5: Standards, paragraph 1.1.5(e)(1) by engaging in the disrespect and maltreatment of another employee; Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 5: Standards, paragraph 1.1.5(h) by making a false report, written or oral; and, Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 5: Standards, paragraph 1.1.5(w) by engaging in disorderly conduct during work hours and on State property.

The OEIG recommends that the Secretary of State take whatever disciplinary action it deems appropriate with respect to Sutchar. The OEIG also recommends that the Secretary of State

---

<sup>1</sup> [The information in this footnote is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined that reasonable cause did not exist to believe a violation of law or policy had occurred. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this paragraph pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20- 52.]

<sup>2</sup> [The information in this footnote is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined that reasonable cause did not exist to believe a violation of law or policy had occurred. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this paragraph pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20- 52.]

<sup>3</sup> [The information in this footnote is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined that reasonable cause did not exist to believe a violation of law or policy had occurred. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this paragraph pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20- 52.]

<sup>4</sup> [The information in this footnote is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined that reasonable cause did not exist to believe a violation of law or policy had occurred. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this paragraph pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20- 52.]

<sup>5</sup> [ The information in this footnote is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined that reasonable cause did not exist to believe a violation of law or policy had occurred. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this paragraph pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20- 52.]

implement measures to help ensure that Sutchar does not continue to engage in such inappropriate conduct and behavior in the workplace in the future. Finally, the OEIG recommends a copy of this report be placed in Sutchar's personnel file.

No further investigative action is warranted, and this case is considered closed.

Date: April 29, 2022

Office of Executive Inspector General for the Illinois  
Secretary of State  
324 W. Monroe St.  
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Megan E. Morgan  
Acting Executive Inspector General

Tammy Raynor  
Special Agent II



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

JESSE WHITE • Secretary of State

March 3, 2022

Bruce Sutchar  
[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Sutchar:

This letter is to advise you that your administrative leave of absence with pay is terminated and you are being discharged as a probationary employee with the Office of the Secretary of State. Your probationary discharge is effective the close of business on **March 3, 2022**. This action is in accordance with Department of Personnel Rule 420.430(j). The reason for the discharge is as follows:

**STATEMENT OF POLICIES**

**Charge #1:** Failure to treat all members of the public and other employees promptly, fairly, impartially, and with equal dignity; in violation of the Office of the Secretary of State Policy Manual, Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 1: Courtesy, paragraph 1.1.1(a).

**Charge #2:** Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person; in violation of the Office of Secretary of State Policy Manual, Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 5: Standards, paragraph 1.1.5(e)(1).

**Charge #3:** Making a false report, written or oral; in violation of the Office of Secretary of State Policy Manual, Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 5: Standards, paragraph 1.1.5(h).

**Charge #4:** Disorderly conduct during working hours or on State properties, including but not limited to, instigating or causing any interruption or impeding of work; in violation of the Office of Secretary of State Policy Manual, Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 5: Standards, paragraph 1.1.5(w).

*Further, pursuant to Section 420.310(d)(1)(H), your name shall be permanently removed from all eligible lists.*

Upon receipt of this letter, it will be necessary for you to turn in your Secretary of State Identification badge, and any state-owned uniforms, supplies, tools and keys.

Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

Stephan J. Roth, Director  
Department of Personnel

SJR/lr 22-018

cc: Nykeba Gardner, Chief Deputy Director  
Department of Driver Services

**USPS: Certified Mail/Return Receipt Requested: 7014 2870 0000 3431 8680**