

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST)	
FOR REVIEW BY:)	CHARGE NO.: 2011CF3316
)	EEOC NO.: 21BA11728
TRACY LYNN ROBINSON,)	ALS NO.: 12-0581
)	
Petitioner.)	

ORDER

This matter coming before the Commission by a panel of three, Commissioners Diane M. Viverito,¹ Michael Bigger, and Amy Kurson presiding, upon Tracy Lynn Robinson’s (“Petitioner”) Request for Review (“Request”) of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)² of Charge No. 2011CF3316 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 7, 2011, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that the State of Illinois, Secretary of State (“Employer”) issued charges against her, suspended her, and denied her a reasonable accommodation due to her disabilities in violation of Section 2-102(A) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”). On February 28, 2012, the Respondent dismissed the Petitioner’s charge for lack of substantial evidence. The Petitioner filed a timely Request.

The Commission concludes that the Respondent properly dismissed the Petitioner’s charge for lack of substantial evidence. If no substantial evidence of discrimination exists after the Respondent’s investigation of a charge, the charge must be dismissed. 775 ILCS 5/7A-102(D). Substantial evidence exists when the evidence is such that a reasonable mind would find the evidence sufficient to support a conclusion. In re Request for Review of John L. Schroeder, IHRC, Charge No. 1993CA2747, 1995 WL 793258, *2 (March 7, 1995).

To establish a *prima facie* case of discrimination, the Petitioner must show: 1) she is a member of a protected class; 2) she was performing her job satisfactorily; 3) she was subject to an adverse action; and 4) the Employer treated a similarly situated employee outside her protected class more favorably under similar circumstances. Marinelli v. Human Rights Comm’n, 262 Ill. App. 3d 247, 253 (2d Dist. 1994).

¹ This Order is in accordance with a vote cast by Commissioner Viverito prior to the expiration of her 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.”

