



**Office of the Executive Inspector General**  
**for the Secretary of State**  
**Summary Report**

This investigation by the Office of the Executive Inspector General 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**

The Office of Executive Inspector General (OEIG) received two customer complaints on March 26, 2021 forwarded by the Department of Driver Services Metro Operations management. The customer and her mother had submitted written complaints to that department on March 25, 2021. Their complaints alleged that Secretary of State (SOS) employee Public Service Representative (PSR) Jason Snider had made inappropriate comments to the customer while she was alone in her vehicle with him during a road exam. The customer reported that Snider had asked if she was single and if she would date him. Although the customer attempted to redirect the conversation, Snider persisted and asked if she liked older men and when she responded, “No”, asked what type of men she did like. The customer said that Snider had made her extremely uncomfortable during the exam and she feared that he regularly preys upon young females during road tests thereby abusing his position of authority. The customer’s mother’s complaint alleged that immediately after returning from the road test, the customer had told her that she had felt extremely uncomfortable due to Snider’s inappropriate comments to her and the nature of those comments.

**II. Investigation**

In a telephonic interview conducted on April 1, 2021, complainant (the customer) told OEIG Inspector Tammy Raynor that Aurora facility Public Service Representative Jason Snider made inappropriate sexual remarks to her during a road exam on March 25, 2021. The complainant recalled that during the exam, she and Snider had initially engaged in casual conversation but said approximately seven or eight minutes into the driving route, Snider asked if she was single and if so, what would it take in order for her to date him. The complainant said she told Snider that she did not date. Snider then had asked if she refrained from dating because she had suffered bad experiences with men. The complainant then told Snider that she did not date strangers and attempted to change the subject. The complainant said Snider had persisted and asked if she liked older men. When she responded, “No”, he had asked what type of men she did like. The

complainant said she did not answer and again attempted to change the subject. A short time later, upon returning to the facility after the exam, the complainant said she informed her mother about Snider's behavior. Together they filled out customer service surveys describing Snider's behavior during the exam ([References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report]), and subsequently reported him to the facility manager. The complainant said Snider had made her extremely uncomfortable during the exam. She fears that he regularly preys upon young females during road tests. The complainant affirmed that Snider had not proposed any form of quid pro quo in exchange for giving her a passing score on her road test.

On April 6, 2021, OEIG investigators conducted an interview with Jason Snider. Snider had signed a waiver consenting to proceed with the interview without the presence of union representation. [References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report]. All attendees at the interview wore face masks and complied with SOS social distance protocols. At the outset of the interview, Snider acknowledged his obligation to answer questions truthfully. Snider was advised that the purpose of the interview was to discuss the allegation that he had made inappropriate sexual remarks to the complainant during a road test on March 25, 2021. Snider said his facility manager had previously informed him about the complaint and had directed him to submit a written statement regarding the matter ([References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report]). In the statement Snider denied asking the female applicant out on a date. At the request of OEIG investigators, Snider read the statement aloud; after which he affirmed it was the statement he had written and given to his facility manager. Snider then stated that he did not want to make any changes to the statement.

Snider acknowledged his initials as the road test examiner on the complainant's driver's license application and road test score sheet and confirmed that he had administered the exam to her on March 25, 2021. Snider denied the allegation that he had asked the complainant if she liked older men and what it would take in order for her to date him. Snider further denied having asked her if she had had bad experiences with men or what type of men she liked. Snider claimed he had merely made innocuous conversation with the complainant to calm her nerves during the exam. When asked specifically what he had conversed with her about, Snider admitted that he had asked if she was single and how old she was, but stated he had never asked her to date him and contended there had been nothing sexual about their conversation.

When asked if there have been previous allegations that he had made inappropriate sexual remarks to female applicants during road tests, Snider said, "No." OEIG investigators then reminded Snider of a previous Secretary of State Office of Inspector General (OIG) investigation (Case16-0055) for which he had received an eighteen-day suspension after the mother of a seventeen-year-old female complained he had made inappropriate remarks to her daughter during a road test on December 16, 2016. [References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report]. According to the disciplinary report, the applicant told her mother that Snider had asked during the exam if she liked older men or would date him. Snider remembered the 2016 allegation

but sought to distinguish it from the current allegations saying that applicant had been younger whereas the complainant was “an adult.” OEIG investigators reminded Snider that in the 2016 case, he had similarly claimed that he had merely been making conversation with the teen in order to calm her nerves.

When asked if there had been any other allegations of him having made inappropriate remarks or having behaved inappropriately with female applicants, Snider again said “No.” OEIG investigators again informed Snider that disciplinary records from the Department of Personnel indicated otherwise. Upon hearing this, Snider admitted there had been several more allegations against him. Snider was asked to explain why he has been accused of making inappropriate sexual remarks to female applicants numerous times, if none of the allegations were true and why he would not be forthcoming with investigators.

Snider wept and said that he has a problem with his attraction to young girls and said he is unable to keep himself from asking them for dates during road exams. When asked again whether he had made the remarks as alleged by the complainant during her March 25, 2021 exam, Snider at this point contradicted his written statement and previous interview answers and responded “Yes.” Snider admitted that the complainant was telling the truth and that he had previously lied to the investigators about his actions. He admitted that he had asked the complainant during the road test on March 25, 2021, about her dating situation and if she would date him. Snider then requested help from the Employee Assistance Program and submitted a written statement attesting to that request. [References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report].

Snider acknowledged that he had known that he had this problem at least as far back as the 2016 investigation. When asked why he had he not sought help for his problem then, before having administered hundreds more road tests to young girls, Snider said he did not know why he had not sought help previously. Snider acknowledged that it was inappropriate to conduct himself in this manner in the course of his duties as an SOS employee. When asked why he had repeatedly done so anyway, he proclaimed he “is lonely” and could not control himself from seeking companionship when he is alone with females on road tests. When asked what percentage of road test applicants he estimates he has asked to date him, Snider responded “about twenty-five percent.” When asked how he determines which applicants to engage in such conversations, Snider said he would choose talkative applicants. Inspector Raynor asked Snider to estimate how many SOS road-test applicants he had asked to date him. Snider replied “hundreds,” but claimed he had never actually gone out on dates with any of them. He further denied having contacted any applicants after their exams.

However, according to another previous SOS OIG investigation (Case 10-0009), on February 23, 2010, a customer reported that Snider, who was assigned to the Plano facility at the time, had processed her driver’s license renewal on February 19, 2010. The customer stated that Snider had contacted her on social media that same evening. Additionally, the customer had

claimed that Snider had asked for her phone number when processing her application purporting it to be a requirement for renewing her driver's license and she had provided it. Upon questioning in that case, Snider claimed that the complainant's name showed up on his [social media] account as a friend suggestion and denied any further wrongdoing. Snider agreed to have no further contact with the complainant and received a written reprimand. [References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report].

Additionally, on June 16, 2010, Snider received an oral warning from the Department of Personnel pertaining to an incident that occurred on or about May 22, 2010, wherein Snider engaged in conversation beyond the purview of his job duties with a female applicant and he exchanged telephone numbers with the applicant. [References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report].

Further, Department of Personnel records indicate that on January 19, 2012, the mother of a sixteen-year-old female applicant complained to the Driver Services department that Snider had made inappropriate remarks to her daughter during a road test on January 18, 2012. Subsequently, Snider admitted to having asked the minor if she was single, and how old she was. Reportedly, he had told the teen he was single, thirty-two years old and that he would go out with her, if he were younger. Snider received a three-day suspension resulting from the complaint. [References the investigatory file and is not part of the summary report].

### **III. Recommendation**

[The information in this paragraph is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined was unfounded. The OEIG concludes that an allegation is "founded" when it has determined that there is reasonable cause to believe that a violation of law or policy has occurred, or that there has 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(a).]<sup>1 2</sup>.

However, this investigation has also resulted in a determination that reasonable cause exists to believe that Snider's misconduct did implicate various SOS policies such as the provisions

---

<sup>1</sup> [The information in this footnote is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined was unfounded. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this subsection pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52(a).].

<sup>2</sup> [The information in this footnote is redacted because it relates to an allegation that the OEIG determined was unfounded. Therefore, the Commission exercises its discretion to redact this subsection pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52(a).].

relating to professionalism, lawfulness, standards, official investigations, and sexual harassment among potential others.

The OEIG recommends that the Secretary of State take whatever disciplinary action it deems appropriate with respect to Snider. The OEIG also recommends that the Secretary of State implement measures to help ensure that Snider 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 Snider's personnel file.

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

Date: May 4, 2021

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

September 10, 2021

Jason Snider  
[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Snider:

This letter is to confirm your discharge, effective the close of business on **September 10, 2021** from your position with the Office of the Secretary of State. This discharge is for just cause, and is in accordance with the Department of Personnel Rule 420.430. No rebuttal was received during the prescribed time period.

*Further, pursuant to Section 420.310(d)(2)(G), your name shall be permanently removed from all eligible lists.*

A certified employee who has been served with approved charges of discharge may appeal to the Secretary of State Merit Commission at, 421 East Capitol, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Springfield, Illinois 62756, provided such appeal is made in writing within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of such approved charges.

Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

Stephan J. Roth, Director /s/κ  
Department of Personnel

SJR/lr 21-100

cc: Rocco M. Abbinanti, Director  
Department of Driver Services

UPS: Delivery Confirmation/Signature Required: 1Z764RF32494067171



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

JESSE WHITE • Secretary of State

August 18, 2021

Jason Snider  
[REDACTED]

Proposed Discharge

Dear Mr. Snider:

This letter is to inform you that you are being considered for discharge from your position with the Office of the Secretary of State, in accordance with the Department of Personnel Rule 420.430(f). The charges related to the proposed discharge are as follows:

**STATEMENT OF CHARGES**

**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:** Engaging in any conduct unbecoming and/or activities on or off duty which might result in or create the appearance of affecting adversely the confidence of the public in the integrity of the office; in violation of the Office of Secretary of State Policy Manual, Chapter 1, Number 1, Article 3: Professionalism, paragraph 1.1.3(b)(3).

**Charge #3:** 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).

**FACTS GIVING RISE TO DISCHARGE**

On or about March 26, 2021, the Department of Driver Services (DSD) submitted two (2) customer complaints to the Office of the Executive Inspector General (OEIG). Those complaints allege that you made inappropriate comments to an applicant during a road exam. The OEIG initiated an investigation into those allegations.

During the course of its investigation, the OEIG conducted interviews, reviewed applicant data and video tape surveillance. Their investigation verified that you were the employee who conducted the road exam for the complaining party.

On or about April 1, 2021, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) interviewed the complainant. She reiterated her allegation that you made inappropriate comments during the road exam. She explained that you had initially engaged in casual conversation but that it soon turned inappropriate when you asked her if she was single. She also alleges that you asked her what it "would take for her to date you". You

continued to ask inappropriate questions such as questioning whether she dated older men and asking what type of men she liked. The complainant indicated that she attempted to change the conversation after each question, but you were persistent.

On or about April 6, 2021, you participated in an interview with Investigators from the OIG. During that interview, you admitted to engaging in casual conversation with the applicant to calm her down. When pressed for details of your conversation, you admitted to asking if the applicant was "single". This was also confirmed by a written statement you had previously provided to your manager.

During the interview, the OIG asked if you had previously been accused of inappropriate behavior and/or comments during a road exam. You advised the OIG that you had not been the subject of previous complaints. The OIG then raised issues of your previous disciplinary actions which include a suspension for conduct eerily similar to the allegations raised in this complaint. You ultimately broke down and admitted that you have a problem of controlling yourself with young girls during road exams. You retracted your written statement and advised the OIG that you had in fact asked the complaint in this case the questions she alleged. You also advised the OIG that over the course of your career with the Secretary of State you had asked out hundreds of young women during road exams.

Your conduct was predatory and disgusting. Your actions violated Secretary of State Policies as cited in Charges #1, #2 and #3, above.

*For historical purposes, Mr. Snider received an 18-day suspension in calendar year 2017 for violation of the same charges. The facts in that case were also very similar to the facts in this case.*

From receipt of this letter, you have four (4) working days within which to submit any statement or evidence you wish to be considered in your defense to my attention at 17 North State Street, Suite 1300, Chicago, Illinois 60602. Your rebuttal must be postmarked by **August 25, 2021**. The information you submit will be considered before a final decision is made. After the expiration of the rebuttal period, you will be notified as to the decision in your case.

Further, you are suspended pending discharge effective at the close of business on **August 18, 2021** until a final decision is made in your case. You are not permitted on Secretary of State Property, including but not limited to your work location, unless for personal business. If you have personal business that must be conducted with the Office of the Secretary of State, i.e. driver's license, title registration, etc., you must contact Lindsay Richmond with the Department of Personnel @ (312) 793-5515 to obtain permission. Upon receipt of this letter, it will be necessary that you turn in your ID badge and any state-owned supplies, equipment, tools, uniforms, credit cards and keys to the individual serving you this letter.

Sincerely,

  
Stephan J. Roth, Director  
Department of Personnel

SJR/gd            21-100

cc:    Rocco Abbinanti, Director  
      Department of Driver Services

**HAND DELIVERED/PROOF OF RECEIPT REQUIRED**