

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST)	
FOR REVIEW BY:)	CHARGE NO.: 2011SF2870
)	EEOC NO.: 21BA11402
WILLIAM K. HORN,)	ALS NO.: 12-0665
)	
Petitioner.)	

ORDER

This matter coming before the Commission by a panel of three, Commissioners Michael Bigger, Amy Kurson, and Cheryl Mainor presiding, upon William K. Horn’s (“Petitioner”) Request for Review (“Request”) of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)¹ of Charge No. 2011SF2870 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 March 25, 2011, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that Bay Industrial Safety Services, Inc. (“Employer”) laid him off from work because of his ancestry (Count A) and in retaliation for opposing unlawful discrimination (Count B) in violation of Sections 2-102(A) and 6-101(A) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”). On October 26, 2012, the Respondent dismissed the Petitioner’s Count A for lack of substantial evidence and entered a finding of substantial evidence on Count B. The Petitioner filed a timely Request.

The Commission concludes that the Respondent properly dismissed the Petitioner’s Count A 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 his protected class more favorably under similar circumstances. Marinelli v. Human Rights Comm’n, 262 Ill. App. 3d 247, 253 (2d Dist. 1994).

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.”

