

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF ST. CLAIR COUNTY
STATE OF ILLINOIS**

ELIOT DETERS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Cause No.: 2026LA000845
	)	
MASCOUTAH COMMUNITY UNIT	)	
SCHOOL DISTRICT 19 BOARD OF	)	
EDUCATION,	)	
	)	
Serve at:	)	
421 W. Harnett	)	
Mascoutah, IL 62258	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

COMES NOW Plaintiff Eliot Deters, by and through his attorneys, and for his Complaint for Damages against Defendant Mascoutah Community Unit School District 19 Board of Education (the “District”) states as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This matter arises under the Illinois Human Rights Act (IHRA), 775 ILCS 5/1 et seq., and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. Plaintiff Deters was subjected to discrimination and retaliation based upon his association with his disabled minor children during his employment with the District, including the non-renewal and termination of his teaching contract on July 31, 2024.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Deters is a male resident of Mascoutah, Illinois.

3. Defendant Mascoutah Community Unit School District 19 Board of Education is a body politic and public school district organized and operating under the laws of the State of

Illinois, with its principal office located at 421 W. Harnett, Mascoutah, Illinois 62258. Defendant has the capacity to sue and be sued and is located in St. Clair County, Illinois.

4. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was an employer employing 15 or more employees.

5. All facts giving rise to this cause of action occurred in or about St. Clair County, Illinois.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. Venue in this Court is proper because the allegations that gave rise to this action occurred in St. Clair County, Illinois.

7. On or about October 23, 2024, Plaintiff timely filed a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and dual-filed the charge with the Illinois Department of Human Rights (IDHR). The EEOC docketed Plaintiff's charge as Charge No. 560-2025-00385. The IDHR assigned the charge IDHR Control No. 251104006.

8. On or about March 31, 2026, the EEOC issued a Notice of Right to Sue for the above charge. A copy of the Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

9. On or about May 14, 2026, the IDHR issued a Notice of Right to Sue adopting the EEOC's determination. A copy of the Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

10. Plaintiff files this action within 90 days of receiving those Notices of Right to Sue.

11. Plaintiff has complied with all applicable administrative exhaustion requirements prior to filing this action.

FACTS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

12. Plaintiff Deters worked as an Educator for Defendant at Mascoutah High School in Mascoutah, Illinois, from about August 2023 until the non-renewal and termination of his teaching contract on July 31, 2024.

13. Plaintiff Deters reported to Defendant employees Principal Amy Kelly Johnson, Assistant Superintendent Brandon Woodrome, and Superintendent Dr. Dave Deets throughout his employment.

14. During his employment with Defendant, Plaintiff Deters performed his job duties and responsibilities in a satisfactory manner.

15. Plaintiff Deters is the father and primary caretaker of two minor children, C.D. and Z.D.

16. Plaintiff's minor child C.D. has Spina Bifida, which includes diagnoses for caudal regression syndrome, sacral agenesis, neurogenic bowel and bladder, generalized muscle weakness, hematochezia, GI bleed, chronic pancreatitis, PRSS-1-related hereditary pancreatitis, pelvic floor dysfunction, clubbed foot status post multiple corrective surgeries, and asthma.

17. C.D.'s conditions substantially impact her ability to perform major life activities.

18. Plaintiff's minor child Z.D. has pancreatic diabetes, type 3C, recently had a total pancreatectomy with autologous islet transplant with splenectomy, and has chronic constipation.

19. Z.D.'s conditions substantially impact her ability to perform major life activities.

20. Both of Plaintiff's children require frequent and unpredictable medical care for their chronic disabilities, and Plaintiff, as their primary caretaker, must attend their medical appointments and provide care for them.

21. When Plaintiff was hired by Defendant, he informed Defendant that his minor children C.D. and Z.D. had serious chronic health conditions that required him to take time off work to care for them and take them to medical appointments.

22. At the time of his hiring, Assistant Superintendent Brandon Woodrome, was aware of the health challenges faced by Plaintiff's two daughters.

23. Upon being hired, Plaintiff Deters immediately enrolled in the Teacher's Union Sick Bank to assist him in having sufficient paid time off work, in addition to his paid vacation days, to care for his chronically ill and disabled children.

24. During Plaintiff's employment, Plaintiff's physicians submitted letters to Defendant requesting accommodations for Plaintiff to allow him to attend his children's medical appointments and care for his chronically ill children.

25. On multiple occasions during Plaintiff's employment, Defendant did not allow Plaintiff to collect pay for sick days when he should have been entitled to do so.

26. On or about February 14, 2024, Defendant told Plaintiff Deters to submit a letter of resignation by that Friday, or he would be subject to non-renewal of his teaching contract for the 2024-2025 school year.

27. Plaintiff Deters refused to turn in a letter of resignation.

28. On February 14, 2024, Plaintiff Deters complained to Defendant that he was being targeted for non-renewal of his teaching contract due to his children's disabilities, which required him to take time away from work to care for them and obtain necessary medical treatment for their survival.

29. Plaintiff's complaint constituted protected activity.

30. On or about July 31, 2024, Defendant refused to renew Plaintiff's teaching contract, thereby terminating his employment.

31. Defendant falsely claimed Plaintiff "had not grown into the leader and education the school is looking for."

32. Defendant's stated reason for the non-renewal was pretextual.

33. Defendant's actions have caused Plaintiff Deters to suffer lost compensation and benefits of employment, emotional distress, and attorneys' fees.

VIOLATIONS OF LAW

COUNT I

DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION **IN VIOLATION OF THE ILLINOIS HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

32. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference as if set out fully herein all previous paragraphs of this Complaint.

33. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was an employer as defined by the Illinois Human Rights Act, 775 ILCS 5/1 et seq.

34. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff Deters was an employee of Defendant.

35. Plaintiff's minor children C.D. and Z.D. have health conditions that substantially affect one or more major life activities and constitute disabilities.

36. Plaintiff Deters is associated with, and is the primary caretaker of, persons with disabilities within the meaning of the Illinois Human Rights Act.

37. Defendant was aware of Plaintiff's minor children's disabilities and of Plaintiff's need to take time off work to care for them.

38. Defendant took negative employment actions against Plaintiff during his employment, including denying Plaintiff paid sick days to which he was entitled, directing Plaintiff to resign, and refusing to renew Plaintiff's teaching contract.

39. Plaintiff's association with his disabled minor children was a motivating factor in Defendant's actions against him.

40. Defendant's actions constituted disability discrimination by association in violation of the Illinois Human Rights Act, 775 ILCS 5/1 et seq.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court, after trial by jury, find for Plaintiff and against Defendant and enter judgment for Plaintiff in excess of \$25,000 for Plaintiff's lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of litigation, and such other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT II

DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION **IN VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT**

43. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference as if set out fully herein all previous paragraphs of this Complaint.

44. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was an employer as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.

45. Plaintiff's minor children C.D. and Z.D. have conditions that substantially affect one or more major life activities and constitute disabilities under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(1).

46. As of the date Plaintiff was hired, Defendant was aware of both of Plaintiff's children's disabilities and of Plaintiff's need to take regular and often unexpected time off work to care for his disabled children.

47. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff when Defendant denied Plaintiff paid sick days to which he was entitled, directed Plaintiff to resign under threat of non-renewal, and refused to renew Plaintiff's teaching contract.

48. Plaintiff's children's disabilities were a motivating factor in Defendant's actions against him.

49. Defendant's actions have caused Plaintiff Deters to suffer lost compensation and benefits of employment, emotional distress, and attorneys' fees.

50. Defendant's actions constituted discrimination against Plaintiff due to his association with his disabled minor children in violation of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111.

51. Defendant's actions were outrageous and were undertaken with malicious intent and/or in reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights to be free from discrimination.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court, after trial by jury, find for Plaintiff and against Defendant and enter judgment for Plaintiff in excess of \$25,000 for Plaintiff's lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, punitive damages, pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of litigation, and such other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT III

RETALIATION **IN VIOLATION OF THE ILLINOIS HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

53. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference as if set out fully herein all previous paragraphs of this Complaint.

54. During his employment, Plaintiff Deters made complaints that Defendant was discriminating against him because of his association with his disabled minor children.

55. Plaintiff's complaints to Defendant constituted protected activity under the Illinois Human Rights Act, 775 ILCS 5/1 et seq.

56. Following Plaintiff's protected activity, Defendant told Plaintiff he would have to voluntarily resign or have his teaching contract not renewed.

57. When Plaintiff refused to resign, Defendant refused to renew Plaintiff's teaching contract, terminating his employment on July 31, 2024.

58. Plaintiff's protected activity was a motivating factor in Defendant's actions against him.

59. Defendant's actions have caused Plaintiff Deters to suffer lost compensation and benefits of employment, emotional distress, and attorneys' fees.

60. Defendant's actions constituted retaliation in violation of the Illinois Human Rights Act, 775 ILCS 5/1 et seq.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court, after trial by jury, find for Plaintiff and against Defendant and enter judgment for Plaintiff in excess of \$25,000 for Plaintiff's lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of litigation, and such other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT IV

RETALIATION **IN VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT**

64. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference as if set out fully herein all previous paragraphs of this Complaint.

65. During his employment, Plaintiff Deters made complaints that Defendant was discriminating against him because of his association with his disabled minor children.

66. Plaintiff's complaints to Defendant constituted protected activity.

67. Defendant was aware of Plaintiff's children's disabilities as of the date he was hired and of Plaintiff's need to take time off work to care for his disabled children.

68. Following Plaintiff's protected activity on February 14, 2024, Defendant told Plaintiff he would have to voluntarily resign or have his teaching contract not renewed.

69. When Plaintiff refused to resign, Defendant further retaliated against Plaintiff by refusing to renew his teaching contract and terminating his employment on July 31, 2024.

70. Plaintiff's protected activity was a motivating factor in Defendant's retaliatory actions against him, including his termination.

71. Defendant's actions have caused Plaintiff Deters to suffer lost compensation and benefits of employment, emotional distress, and attorneys' fees.

72. Defendant's actions constituted retaliation against Plaintiff due to his complaint of disability discrimination in violation of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12230.

73. Defendant's actions were outrageous and were undertaken with malicious intent and/or in reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights to be free from retaliation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court, after trial by jury, find for Plaintiff and against Defendant and enter judgment for Plaintiff in excess of \$25,000 for Plaintiff's lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, punitive damages, pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of litigation, and such other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY

74. Plaintiff requests a trial by jury on all matters triable by jury.

Respectfully submitted,

KENNEDY HUNT, P.C.

By: /s/ Sarah Jane Hunt

Sarah Jane Hunt, #6316235

Nicole Matlock

Kennedy Hunt, P.C.

4500 West Pine Blvd.

St. Louis, MO 63108

(314) 872-9041

(314) 872-9043 fax

sarahjane@kennedyhuntlaw.com

nmatlock@kennedyhuntlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF



U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

St. Louis District Office
1222 Spruce St, Rm 8 100
St Louis, MO 63103
(314) 798-1960
Website: www.eeoc.gov

DETERMINATION AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

(This Notice replaces EEOC Forms 161, 161-A & 161-B)

Issued On: 03/31/2026

To: Eliot Deters
618 East Main Street
Mascoutah, IL 62258

Charge No: 560-2025-00385

EEOC Representative and email: Walter Harris
Equal Opportunity Investigator
walter.harris@eeoc.gov

DETERMINATION AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

The EEOC issues the following determination: The EEOC will not proceed further with its investigation and makes no determination about whether further investigation would establish violations of the statute. This does not mean the claims have no merit. This determination does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. The EEOC makes no finding as to the merits of any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge.

NOTICE OF YOUR RIGHT TO SUE

This is official notice that the EEOC has dismissed your charge and has issued you notice of your right to sue the respondent(s) on this charge. If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) on this charge under federal law in federal or state court, **your lawsuit must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of EEOC's official notice of dismissal.** You should keep a record of the date you received the EEOC's official notice of dismissal. Your right to sue based on this charge will be lost if you do not file a lawsuit in court within 90 days. (The time limit for filing a lawsuit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

If you file a lawsuit based on this charge, please sign-in to the EEOC Public Portal and upload the court complaint to charge 560-2025-00385.

On behalf of the Commission,

Digitally Signed By: David Davis
03/31/2026

David Davis
District Director

Exhibit 1

Cc:

Julie Bruch
IFMK Law, Ltd.
650 Dundee Rd Ste 475
Northbrook, IL 60062

Dave Deets
Mascoutah School District 19
421 West Harnett
Mascoutah, IL 62258

Nicole Matlock
Kennedy Hunt P.C.
4500 West Pine Blvd
Saint Louis, MO 63108

Please retain this Notice for your records.

INFORMATION RELATED TO FILING SUIT UNDER THE LAWS ENFORCED BY THE EEOC

*(This information relates to filing suit in Federal or State court **under Federal law**. If you also plan to sue claiming violations of State law, please be aware that time limits may be shorter and other provisions of State law may be different than those described below.)*

IMPORTANT TIME LIMITS – 90 DAYS TO FILE A LAWSUIT

If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) named in the charge of discrimination, you must file a complaint in court **within 90 days of the date you receive EEOC's official notice of dismissal**. You should **keep a record of the date you received EEOC's official notice of dismissal**. Once this 90-day period has passed, your right to sue based on the charge referred to in this Notice will be lost. If you intend to consult an attorney, you should do so promptly. Give your attorney a copy of this Notice, and the record of your receiving EEOC's official notice of dismissal (email or envelope).

If your lawsuit includes a claim under the Equal Pay Act (EPA), you must file your complaint in court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the date you did not receive equal pay. This time limit for filing an EPA lawsuit is separate from the 90-day filing period under Title VII, the ADA, GINA, the ADEA, or the PWFA referred to above. Therefore, if you also plan to sue under Title VII, the ADA, GINA, the ADEA, or the PWFA, in addition to suing on the EPA claim, your lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of your receipt of EEOC's official notice of dismissal and within the 2- or 3-year EPA period.

Your lawsuit may be filed in U.S. District Court or a State court of competent jurisdiction. Whether you file in Federal or State court is a matter for you to decide after talking to your attorney. You must file a "complaint" that contains a short statement of the facts of your case which shows that you are entitled to relief. Filing this Notice is not enough. For more information about filing a lawsuit, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

ATTORNEY REPRESENTATION

For information about locating an attorney to represent you, go to:
<https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

In very limited circumstances, a U.S. District Court may appoint an attorney to represent individuals who demonstrate that they are financially unable to afford an attorney.

HOW TO REQUEST YOUR CHARGE FILE AND 90-DAY TIME LIMIT FOR REQUESTS

There are two ways to request a charge file: 1) a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request or 2) a "Section 83" request. You may request your charge file under either or both procedures. EEOC can generally respond to Section 83 requests more promptly than FOIA requests.

Since a lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of EEOC's official notice of dismissal, please submit your FOIA and/or Section 83 request for the charge file promptly to allow sufficient time for EEOC to respond and for your review.

To make a FOIA request for your charge file, submit your request online at <https://eeoc.arkcase.com/foia/portal/login> (this is the preferred method). You may also submit a

FOIA request for your charge file by U.S. Mail by submitting a signed, written request identifying your request as a “FOIA Request” for Charge Number 560-2025-00385 to the District Director at David Davis, 1222 Spruce St Rm 8 100, St Louis, MO 63103.

To make a Section 83 request for your charge file, submit a signed written request stating it is a “Section 83 Request” for Charge Number 560-2025-00385 to the District Director at David Davis, 1222 Spruce St Rm 8 100, St Louis, MO 63103.

You may request the charge file up to 90 days after receiving EEOC’s official notice of dismissal. After the 90 days have passed, you may request the charge file only if you have filed a lawsuit in court and provide a copy of the court complaint to EEOC.

For more information on submitting FOIA requests, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/foia/index.cfm>.

For more information on submitted Section 83 requests, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/foia/section-83-disclosure-information-charge-files>.

NOTICE OF RIGHTS UNDER THE ADA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008 (ADAAA)

The ADA was amended, effective January 1, 2009, to broaden the definitions of disability to make it easier for individuals to be covered under the ADA/ADAAA. A disability is still defined as (1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities (actual disability); (2) a record of a substantially limiting impairment; or (3) being regarded as having a disability. *However, these terms are redefined, and it is easier to be covered under the new law.*

If you plan to retain an attorney to assist you with your ADA claim, we recommend that you share this information with your attorney and suggest that he or she consult the amended regulations and appendix, and other ADA related publications, available at: http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/disability_regulations.cfm.

“Actual” disability or a “record of” a disability

If you are pursuing a failure to accommodate claim you must meet the standards for either “actual” or “record of” a disability:

- ✓ **The limitations from the impairment no longer must be severe or significant** for the impairment to be considered substantially limiting.
- ✓ In addition to activities such as performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, thinking, concentrating, reading, bending, and communicating (more examples at 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(i)), **“major life activities” now include the operation of major bodily functions**, such as: functions of the immune system, special sense organs and skin; normal cell growth; and digestive, genitourinary, bowel, bladder, neurological, brain, respiratory, circulatory, cardiovascular, endocrine, hemic, lymphatic, musculoskeletal, and reproductive functions; or the operation of an individual organ within a body system.
- ✓ **Only one** major life activity need be substantially limited.
- ✓ Except for ordinary eyeglasses or contact lenses, the beneficial effects of **“mitigating measures”** (e.g., hearing aid, prosthesis, medication, therapy, behavioral modifications)

are not considered in determining if the impairment substantially limits a major life activity.

- ✓ An impairment that is **“episodic”** (e.g., epilepsy, depression, multiple sclerosis) or **“in remission”** (e.g., cancer) is a disability if it **would be substantially limiting when active**.
- ✓ An impairment **may be substantially limiting even though** it lasts or is expected to last **fewer than six months**.

“Regarded as” coverage

An individual can meet the definition of disability if an **employment action was taken because of an actual or perceived impairment** (e.g., refusal to hire, demotion, placement on involuntary leave, termination, exclusion for failure to meet a qualification standard, harassment, or denial of any other term, condition, or privilege of employment).

- ✓ “Regarded as” coverage under the ADAAA no longer requires that an impairment be substantially limiting, or that the employer perceives the impairment to be substantially limiting.
- ✓ The employer has a defense against a “regarded as” claim only when the impairment at issue is objectively **both** transitory (lasting or expected to last six months or less) **and** minor.
- ✓ A person is not able to bring a failure to accommodate claim **if** the individual is covered only under the “regarded as” definition of “disability.”

***Note:** Although the amended ADA states that the definition of disability “shall be construed broadly” and “should not demand extensive analysis,” some courts require specificity in the complaint explaining how an impairment substantially limits a major life activity or what facts indicate the challenged employment action was because of the impairment. Beyond the initial pleading stage, some courts will require specific evidence to establish disability. For more information, consult the amended regulations and appendix, as well as explanatory publications, available at http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/disability_regulations.cfm.*



State of Illinois Department of Human Rights

dhr.illinois.gov

May 14, 2026

Complainant

ELIOT DETERS
C/O NICOLE MATLOCK
KENNEDY HUNT, P.C.
4500 WEST PINE BOULEVARD
ST. LOUIS, MO 63108
nmatlock@kennedyhuntlaw.com

Respondent

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
MASCOUTAH SCHOOL DISTRICT 19
421 W. HARNETT
MASCOUTAH, IL 62258

Re: EEOC Charge No.: 560-2025-00385
IDHR Charge No.: 2025SR3749
ELIOT DETERS VS. MASCOUTAH SCHOOL DISTRICT 19

NOTICE OF EEOC ADOPTED FINDING

You are receiving this letter because Complainant filed a charge with the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"). The EEOC and the Illinois Department of Human Rights ("Department") are parties to a cooperative agreement. Under this agreement, a copy of the discrimination charge Complainant filed with the EEOC was automatically cross-filed with the Department. Attached to this Notice is a copy of the EEOC charge, which was cross-filed under the "IDHR Charge No." identified above.

Since Complainant filed the discrimination charge initially with the EEOC, pursuant to Section 7A-102(A-1)(1) of the Human Rights Act (775 ILCS 5/1-101 et. seq.) the EEOC was the governmental agency responsible for serving and investigating the charge according to EEOC's rules and procedures. The Department has been notified that EEOC has issued its determination, and Complainant has timely requested that IDHR adopt EEOC's findings, so that Complainant may file a complaint in the appropriate circuit court.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that the Department has adopted the EEOC determination of no cause. Based upon EEOC's determination, the Department finds that there is a **LACK OF SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE** to support the allegations of the charge. Accordingly, pursuant to Section 7A-102(A-1)(3)(a) of the Human Rights Act (775 ILCS 5/1-101 et. seq.) and its Rules and Regulations (56 Ill. Adm. Code Chapter II, Section 2520.560), the charge is HEREBY **DISMISSED AND CLOSED**.

IN_NOD&C ADOPT LSE

555 West Monroe Street, 7th Floor, Chicago, IL 60661 | (312) 814-6200 | TTY (866) 740-3953
524 S 2nd Street, 3rd Floor, Springfield, IL 62701 | (217) 785-5100
dhr.illinois.gov

Exhibit 2

Complainant may commence a civil action in the appropriate circuit court or other appropriate court of competent jurisdiction within ninety (90) days after receipt of this Notice. The civil action should be filed in the circuit court in the count where the civil rights violation was allegedly committed. **If Complainant intends to exhaust State remedies, please notify the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission immediately.**

EEOC, John C. Kluczynski Federal Building
230 South Dearborn Street, Suite 1866
Chicago, IL 60604

Complainant is hereby notified that the charge(s) are dismissed with prejudice with no right to further proceed if a timely written complaint is not filed with the appropriate circuit court.

PLEASE NOTE: At this time, this notice and the enclosed EEOC Charge of Discrimination are the only documents in the Department's possession. The Department cannot provide any legal advice or assistance. Please contact legal counsel, your city clerk, or your county clerk with any questions.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
James. L Bennett
Director