

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST)	
FOR REVIEW BY:)	CHARGE NO.: 2012CF1864
)	EEOC NO.: 21BA20695
RONALD SINGLETARY,)	ALS NO.: 12-0631
)	
)	
Petitioner.)	

ORDER

This matter coming before the Commission by a panel of three, Commissioners Hamilton Chang, Steve Kim, and Robert A. Cantone presiding, upon the Request for Review (“Request”) of Ronald Singletary (“Petitioner”), of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)¹ of Charge No. 2012CF1864 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 January 5, 2012, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that Joliet Public Schools District #86 (“Employer”) failed to give him temporary assignments in retaliation for opposing unlawful discrimination, in violation of Section 6-101(A) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”). Petitioner, a custodian, filed a charge of discrimination against Employer on May 24, 2010. On October 3 and 4, 2011, his manager did not give him temporary assignments which paid more than his usual duties.

On July 18, 2012, the Respondent dismissed the Petitioner’s charge in its entirety. The Petitioner filed a timely Request.

A *prima facie* case of retaliation requires evidence that the Petitioner engaged in a protected activity, that they 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 (3rd Dist. 2000). A causal connection will be inferred if the period of time between the protected activity and the adverse action is sufficiently short. See Mitchell and Local Union, 146, 20 Ill. HRC Rep. 101, 110-11 (1985) (six months was too remote to establish connectedness). Petitioner has not shown a causal nexus between his May 2010 charge and the failure to assign seventeen months later. See Lynell Mims and State of Illinois, Illinois Department of Lottery, Charge No. 1989CF1141,

¹ 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.”

1998 WL 937898 (December 17, 1998). (nineteen-month time period between protected activity and adverse action to long to create an inference of retaliation).

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 Joliet Public Schools District #86 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 16th day of November 2018.**
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION)

Commissioner Robert A. Cantone

Commissioner Hamilton Chang

Commissioner Steve Kim