

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST	)	
FOR REVIEW BY:	)	CHARGE NO.: <b>2012CF0173</b>
	)	EEOC NO.: <b>21BA12307</b>
<b>HUGO MENDEZ,</b>	)	ALS NO.: <b>12-0660</b>
	)	
Petitioner.	)	

**ORDER**

This matter coming before the Commission by a panel of three, Commissioners Michael Bigger, Amy Kurson, and Cheryl Mainor presiding, upon Hugo Mendez’s (“Petitioner”) Request for Review (“Request”) of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)<sup>1</sup> of Charge No. 2012CF0173 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 July 21, 2011, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that Levy Premium Foodservice Limited Partnership d/b/a Levy Restaurants (“Employer”) suspended him and discharged him due to his mental disabilities in violation of Section 2-102(A) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”). On July 30, 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) he is a member of a protected class; 2) he was performing his job satisfactorily; 3) he 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).

---

<sup>1</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.”

