

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST)	
FOR REVIEW BY:)	CHARGE NO.: 2011CP3115
)	EEOC NO.: N/A
LISA J. GILLARD,)	ALS NO.: 12-0207
)	
)	
Petitioner.)	

ORDER

This matter coming before the Commission by a panel of three, Commissioners Duke Alden, Patricia Bakalis Yadgir, and Terry Cosgrove¹ presiding, upon the Request for Review (“Request”) of Lisa J. Gillard (“Petitioner”), of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)² of Charge No. 2011CP3115 and the Commission having reviewed all pleadings filed in accordance with 56 Ill. Admin. Code, Ch. XI, Subpt. D, § 5300.400, and the Commission being fully advised upon the premises;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Respondent’s dismissal of the Petitioner’s charge for **LACK OF SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE** is **SUSTAINED**.

DISCUSSION

On April 21, 2011, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that St. Peter’s Church denied her full use of its facilities by limiting her time to pray because of her race, black (Count A); and her religion, Buddhist (Count B), in violation of Section 5-102(A) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”).

On February 22, 2012, the Respondent dismissed the Petitioner’s charge in its entirety. The Petitioner filed a timely Request.

There is no substantial evidence that the Church discriminated against Petitioner. Generally, to establish a *prima facie* case of discrimination concerning a public accommodation, the Petitioner must show: 1) she is a member of a protected class; 2) she was denied full and equal enjoyment of the facilities and services; and 3) similarly situated individuals outside her protected class were treated more favorably. See In the Matter of Velma J. Henderson and Steak N Shake, Inc., IHRC, Charge No. 1996CP2939, 1999 WL 33252627, *9 (March 24, 1994). Petitioner did not provide any evidence that similarly-situated non-black or non-Buddhist persons were treated more favorably.

Accordingly, the Petitioner has not presented any evidence to show that the Respondent’s dismissal of the charge was not in accordance with the Act.

¹ This Order is in accordance with a vote cast by Commissioner Cosgrove prior to the expiration of his term.
² In a request for review proceeding, the Illinois Department of Human Rights is the “Respondent.” The party to the underlying charge requesting review of the Illinois Department of Human Rights’s action shall be referred to as the “Petitioner.”

