

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST)	
FOR REVIEW BY:)	CHARGE NO.: 2012CH2231
)	HUD NO.: 05-12-0468-8
JUHANA STEEN,)	ALS NO.: 12-0734
)	
Petitioner.)	

ORDER

This matter coming before the Commission by a panel of three, Commission Chair Rose Mary Bombela-Tobias and Commissioners Nabi R. Fakroddin and Hermene Hartman presiding, upon Juhana Steen’s (“Petitioner”) Request for Review (“Request”) of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)¹ of Charge No. 2012CH2231 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 February 7, 2012, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that Farwell Condominium Association (“Association”) subjected her to discriminatory terms, conditions, privileges, or services and facilities because of her race in violation of Section 3-102(B) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”). On May 29, 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).

Generally, in order to show the existence of a *prima facie* case of housing discrimination, there must be evidence of the following: (1) the Petitioner is a member of a protected class; (2) the Association was aware of the Petitioner’s membership in that protected class; (3) the Petitioner was a resident in good standing; (4) the Association altered the terms, conditions, and privileges of the Petitioner’s real estate transaction, and (5) the Association treated similarly situated tenants outside of the Petitioner’s protected class more favorably under similar circumstances. In re Warren Corprew

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.”

