

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST	)	
FOR REVIEW BY:	)	CHARGE NO.: <b>2012CA0709</b>
	)	EEOC NO.: <b>21BA12766</b>
<b>CENTERIA MOORE-POWELL,</b>	)	ALS NO.: <b>12-0448</b>
	)	
	)	
Petitioner.	)	

**ORDER**

This matter coming before the Commission by a panel of three, Commissioners Duke Alden, Lauren Beth Gash<sup>1</sup>, and Patricia Bakalis Yadgir presiding, upon the Request for Review (“Request”) of Centeria Moore-Powell (“Petitioner”), of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)<sup>2</sup> of Charge No. 2012CA0709 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 Petitioner’s charge for **LACK OF SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE** is **SUSTAINED**.

**DISCUSSION**

On September 14, 2011, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that City of Chicago, Chicago Police Department (“Employer”) harassed her due to her race, age, sex, and in retaliation for opposing unlawful discrimination, in violation of Sections 2-102(A) and 6-101(A) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”).

On April 30, 2012, the Respondent dismissed the Petitioner’s charge in its entirety. The Petitioner filed a timely Request.

Petitioner has not presented a *prima facie* case of harassment by her colleagues and supervisors. Harassment must be so severe and pervasive that it alters the conditions of employment and creates an abusive working environment. Harris v. Forklift Systems, Inc., 510 U.S. 17, 20 (1993). Petitioner alleges that a fellow police sergeant made isolated comments about her race, sex, and age, but these comments were not “severe and pervasive.” Her supervisors criticized her handling of conflicts with that colleague, but it was within their discretion to supervise Petitioner’s work. Heavy-handed management is unpleasant but does not constitute harassment. Patel v. Allstate Insurance, 105 F.3d 365, 373 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997).

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order is in accordance with a vote cast by Commissioner Gash prior to the expiration of her term.

<sup>2</sup> 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.”

Further, Petitioner has not presented a *prima facie* case of retaliation. She must show that she engaged in a protected activity, that she suffered an adverse action, and that there is evidence of a causal connection between the protected activity and the adverse action. See Welch v. Hoeh, 314 Ill. App. 3d 1027, 1035 (2000). Petitioner presented no evidence that she complained about the harassment, or any other form of discrimination, so she did not engage in a protected activity.

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.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. The dismissal of the Petitioner's charge is hereby **SUSTAINED**.
2. This is a final Order. A final Order may be appealed to the Appellate Court by filing a petition for review, naming the Illinois Human Rights Commission, the Illinois Department of Human Rights, and City of Chicago, Chicago Police Department, as respondents, with the Clerk of the Appellate Court within 35 days after the date of service of this Order.

**STATE OF ILLINOIS** )  
 ) **Entered this 2nd day of November 2018.**  
**HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION** )

Commissioner Duke Alden

Commissioner Lauren Beth Gash

Commissioner Patricia Bakalis Yadgir