

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST)	
FOR REVIEW BY:)	CHARGE NO.: 2012CF2848
)	EEOC NO.: 21BA21386
ABDUL MAUREEDULLAH,)	ALS NO.: 13-0048
)	
)	
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 Abdul Maureedullah (“Petitioner”), of the Notice of Dismissal issued by the Illinois Department of Human Rights (“Respondent”)¹ of Charge No. 2012CF2848 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 dismissal of the Petitioner’s charge for **LACK OF SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE** is **SUSTAINED**.

DISCUSSION

On April 14, 2012, the Petitioner filed a charge of discrimination with the Respondent alleging that Bethel New Life (“Employer”) harassed him and discharged him because of his religion, in violation of Section 2-102(A) of the Illinois Human Rights Act (“Act”).

On January 23, 2013, the Respondent dismissed the Petitioner’s charge in its entirety. The Petitioner filed a timely Request.

Harassment must be so severe and pervasive that it alters the conditions of employment and creates an abusive working environment. Harris v. Forklift Systems, Inc., 510 U.S. 17, 20 (1993). Petitioner alleges that his supervisor called him into her office four or five times during his 90-day probationary period to check on his work, which sometimes interfered with his prayer time. This was not “severe and pervasive.” Further, it was within the supervisor’s discretion to check on Petitioner’s work. Heavy-handed management is unpleasant but does not constitute harassment. Patel v. Allstate Insurance, 105 F.3d 365, 373 (7th Cir. 1997).

To present a *prima facie* case that Petitioner was discharged because of his religion, he must show: 1) he is a member of a protected class; 2) he was performing his work 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

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.”

Ill. App. 3d 247, 253-54 (2d Dist. 1994). Assuming Petitioner made such a case, Employer asserted a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for discharging him: Petitioner accidentally left a voicemail message for supervisor in which he was heard using profanity and disparaging his supervisor and Employer. Petitioner has not shown that this reason was pretext for discrimination. Zaderaka v. Illinois Human Rights Comm'n, 131 Ill. 2d 172, 179 (1989).

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 Bethel New Life 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 21st day of November 2018.**
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION)

Commissioner Robert A. Cantone

Commissioner Hamilton Chang

Commissioner Steve Kim