ORIGINAL

STATE OF INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS AT INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS

COMMISSION MEETING
APRIL 21, 2011

MAY 1 2 2011
INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMM

The meeting was held at 11:40 a.m. on April 21, 2011 at Indiana Government Center South, Conference Room 4, 302 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Wm. F. Daniels, d/b/a
ACCURATE REPORTING OF INDIANA
12922 Brighton Avenue
Carmel IN 46032
(317) 848-0088

PERSONS PRESENT:

David C. Carter, Vice-Chairman, presiding
John E. Garcia, Board Member
Barry Baynard, Board Member
Steven A. Ramos, Board Member
Tehiji G. Crenshaw, Board Member

Joshua Brewster, Deputy Director

Joan T. Essex, Chief Financial Officer

Robert Lange, Administrative Law Judge

Christina Catalan

MR. CARTER: I would like to call the Indiana Civil Rights Commission public meeting for April to order.

And we have a quorum. There are five of us: Commissioners Crenshaw, Ramos, Baynard, Garcia, and I am David Carter.

And, having established the quorum, I believe you have had an opportunity to review the minutes.

May I have a motion to accept them for the discussion thereof?

MR. RAMOS: Motion to approve.

MR. BAYNARD: Second.

MR. CARTER: All in favor?

Any opposed?

Okay.

Financial report, Ms Essex?

MS ESSEX: You should all have a copy of the financial report in your packets. And as it has been for the last several months, we are moving closer to the end of the fiscal year. We are in great shape to do that, and are in line to meet our reversion target of—how much is it?—three hundred and twenty-eight thousand dollars. We should meet that with not much trouble at all, and may even revert more than that.

I will be happy to answer any questions that any of you might have.

MR. CARTER: Questions?

MR. RAMOS: For the budget cycle, are you submitting a budget for the year--

MS ESSEX: The budget is submitted for 2012-2013. And if you look on page 1 of your financial statement, the annual net appropriation, the one million eight fifty-eight, eight eighty-six, that is the base budget for 2012 and 2013. So they've reduced us; we have the fifteen percent reduction. They said, "Just take the fifteen percent off, and that's going to be your base for this year," and we should be able to meet expenses on that. We have obviously been able to do it this year, so we should be in good shape.

MR. RAMOS: Any other expected adjustments in other--

MS ESSEX: No. Now, with normal attrition, and with the fact that we receive our EEOC entitlement cooperative agreement monies, that allows us to help take care of some of expenses for the events as well as reimbursing for administrative costs and training costs and different things like that. So if we did not have those cooperative

agreements, things would be a lot tighter, but we're 1 2 fortunate enough to have those, so they put us in a 3 very good position to do what we need to do. 4 MR. CARTER: Any questions? 5 And hearing none, we move to Old Business. 6 Which are the cases of Collier and Bullock. 7 And they are similar, in that they were both cases 8 that were found no probable cause and were then 9 reversed by the commissioner reviewing them, the case of Collier versus Eytcheson by Commissioner Baynard 10 11 and the case of Bullock versus Cardinal Ritter by 12 Commissioner Carter. 13 So my understanding is that we are to vote on 14 those--Mr. Baynard may not vote on the Collier case, 15 and I will not vote on the Bullock case--whether to 16 accept that reversal or not; is that correct? 17 MR. LANGE: Yes. 18 MR. CARTER: Is that right? 19 So, in the case of Collier versus Eytcheson, 20 may I have a motion to--21 MR. GARCIA: If I can ask a question 22 first. 23 MR. CARTER: You can ask a question 24 when you want to. 25 MR. GARCIA: If we reverse it, it goes

1	back to probable cause
2	MR. CARTER: Correct.
3	MR. GARCIA:is my understanding.
4	Okay. And it gets investigated again, or
5	MR. CARTER: It goes back to Mr. Lange
6	for further proceedings or scheduling a hearing or
7	whatever.
8	MR. GARCIA: Okay.
9	MR. CARTER: I guess I could call for
10	a motion either to reverse or sustain the no probable
11	cause finding.
12	MR. GARCIA: I move we take the recom-
13	mendation of Commissioner Baynard, and reverse it.
14	MR. CARTER: A second?
15	MS CRENSHAW: Second.
16	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
17	Opposed?
18	I oppose reversing, but I am not voting. So
19	it is reversed.
20	Commissioner
21	I mean in the case of Bullock versus Cardinal
22	Ritter, may I have a motion to either sustain the no
23	probable cause order or reverse it?
24	MR. BAYNARD: I make a motion to
25	reverse.

1	MS CRENSHAW: Second.
2	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
3	Any opposed?
4	MR. GARCIA: Aye.
5	MR. CARTER: It is reversed as well.
6	Okay. With that, have we satisfied the
7	protocol?
8	MR. BREWSTER: Yes.
9	MR. CARTER: Okay.
10	I am informed that there is new business:
11	The once-a-year ordeal of election of officers.
12	I will entertain the nominations for the
13	chairperson of the Commission.
14	MR. GARCIA: I'd like to moveor I'd
15	like to nominate Vice-Chairman Carter for Chairman.
16	MR. CARTER: That happened once
17	before.
18	MR. RAMOS: We should have a
19	discussion. The language of the statute provides for
20	annual election.
21	Can we
22	MR. CARTER: Well, later in the
23	meeting.
24	MR. BAYNARD: Would you accept the
25	nomination?

MR. CARTER: Well, only reluctantly; 1 partly it's logistics. I don't live in Indianapolis, 2 and I don't have to come up here all the time. 3 suppose most of it can be done by electronic means, 4 5 so I don't have to be here. I personally see no reason to unseat Alpha. 6 7 MR. GARCIA: Well, if the signing thing is that important, maybe we need somebody that 8 lives in Indianapolis. If we'd like to nominate 9 10 somebody else, too, I guess we can. I'd like to nominate--11 12 MR. RAMOS: You have to withdraw your 13 first recommendation. 14 MR. GARCIA: Why? MR. LANGE: Either withdraw your 15 16 motion or--MR. RAMOS: I think most of the 17 manuals, you have to withdraw your motion. 18 MR. GARCIA: I'm confused. 19 Is it a nomination or a motion? 20 MR. LANGE: It's a nomination. 21 MR. GARCIA: So can I nominate two 22 23 people? MR. CARTER: You can only try. 24 I nominate Commissioner 25 MR. GARCIA:

1	Baynard. Since he lives in Indianapolis, the signing
2	wouldn't be an issue with him. Or close to
3	Indianapolis.
4	MR. BAYNARD: I have to go from
5	Indianapolis to the I have to decline the
6	nomination.
7	MR. RAMOS: What else you got, John?
8	MR. CARTER: What about you?
9	MR. RAMOS: I travel. As it is, I
10	miss more than my fair share. Much as I would love
11	the opportunity, I'm not sure how I could do that.
12	Move that nominations be closed.
13	MR. BAYNARD: I second the nomination.
14	MR. CARTER: Okay well, we have a
15	second.
16	All in favor of retaining Commissioner
17	Blackburn as Chair?
18	Any opposed?
19	MR. GARCIA: Aye.
20	MR. CARTER: Is that nay?
21	MR. GARCIA: Nay.
22	MR. CARTER: Okay.
23	MR. GARCIA: I said nay.
24	MR. CARTER: Now you've heard it. Is
25	that Hammurabi's second law?

1	Well, now some nominations for whateverthe
2	Vice-Chairperson.
3	MR. GARCIA: I nominate Vice-Chair
4	Carter.
5	MR. RAMOS: Second.
6	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
7	Any opposed?
8	Okay. So we'll keep it the way it is. Status
9	quo wins, I guess.
10	We have no consent agreements, so we move to
11	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order.
12	Pedro Diaz Ramos versus Enzo Pizza, and
13	Jocelyn Appleton versus One Vision Corp. d/b/a Vision
14	Sports Club.
15	May I have a motion to accept those findings?
16	MR. GARCIA: I have a question: Is
17	that Enzo's Pizza or Tomaso Carmella that's at issue
18	there?
19	MR. LANGE: Both.
20	MR. CARTER: Both.
21	MR. GARCIA: You don't have any other
22	companies that we might have missed, that we should
23	maybe include?
24	MR. LANGE: No.
25	MR. GARCIA: Okay.

1	MR. CARTER: Having clarified that,
2	may I have a motion to accept or do something else
3	with the findings of facts?
4	MR. GARCIA: I move we accept.
5	MR. CARTER: And a second?
6	MS CRENSHAW: Second.
7	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
8	Any opposed?
9	Report by Commissioners on Complainant
10	Appeals.
11	Commissioner Baynard?
12	MR. BAYNARD: In the cases of Brown
13	versus Lake County Public Defender's Office and the
14	case of Dorsey versus DHI Global Mail, I would
15	recommend to the Commission that we sustain the
16	Deputy Director's finding of no probable cause.
17	MR. CARTER: Okay. May I have motion
18	to accept that?
19	MR. RAMOS: So moved.
20	MR. CARTER: And a second?
21	MS CRENSHAW: Second.
22	MR. CARTER: Any opposedor in
23	agreement? May I have that?
24	All right, any votes for?
25	Okay. Against?

1	Okay. And Roberts is rolling in his grave.
2	And in my cases, Leaven versus Indiana
3	University and Longsdon versus Target Stores, I also
4	recommend that we sustain the no probable cause
5	finding.
6	May I have a motion to accept that
7	recommendation?
8	MS CRENSHAW: So moved.
9	MR. BAYNARD: Second?
10	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
11	Opposed?
12	Thank you.
13	Commissioner Crenshaw?
14	MS CRENSHAW: In the cases of Moises
15	versus R. Concept Industries, Inc. and Muhammad
16	versus Pinnacle Properties Development Group, I make
17	the motion that we uphold the finding of no probable
18	cause in both cases.
19	MR. CARTER: May I have a motion to
20	accept that?
21	MR. BAYNARD: So moved.
22	MR. RAMOS: Seconded.
23	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
24	Any opposed?
25	Mr. Garcia?

1	MR. GARCIA: In the case of Nicholson
2	versus University Elementary School, I recommend that
3	we uphold the Director'sor the Deputy Director's no
4	probable cause.
5	MR. CARTER: May I have a motion to
6	accept that recommendation?
7	MR. BAYNARD: So moved.
8	MS CRENSHAW: Second.
9	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
10	Any opposed?
11	And do you have something further?
12	MR. GARCIA: Perez versus Tyson Foods,
13	Inc., I am going to hold it until the next meeting.
14	MR. CARTER: Mr. Ramos?
15	MR. RAMOS: In the case of Ryan versus
16	Langsford Collision Repair, Inc. and Wyatt versus
17	Reception Diagnostic Center, I recommend we uphold
18	the Director's findings of no probable cause.
19	MR. CARTER: And may I have a motion
20	to accept that?
21	MS CRENSHAW: So moved.
22	MR. CARTER: Second?
23	MR. BAYNARD: Second.
24	MR. CARTER: All in favor?
25	Opposed?

Okay. Assignment of Appeals to 1 2 Commissioners. 3 Mr. Ramos, would you do Commissioner Blackburn's case--4 MR. RAMOS: Yes. 5 MR. CARTER: --Ahissou versus Ryder 6 7 Integrated Logistics, Inc. And that would be Mr. Ramos for Commissioner Blackburn. 8 And Mr. Baynard, if you would review Johnson 9 versus J.P. Morgan Chase Bank. I will review Graves 10 versus Ultimate Construction Services. And 11 Commissioner Crenshaw, Jones versus Indygo 12 Transportation. And Mr. Garcia, Grubb versus Elkhart 13 14 Community Schools. Which brings us to the Administrative Update. 15 MR. BREWSTER: Okay. 16 Mr. Smith obviously briefed you on it, as 17 18 mentioned earlier, but I'll go ahead and kind of 19 repeat that for the record. On April 8 we had a State Fair Housing Event 20 21 here in Indianapolis, in partnership with the Indiana 22 Housing Community Development Authority, Back Home in Indiana Associates, The Governor's Council for People 23 With Disabilities, and also the Indiana -- oh, it's 24

slipped out of my mind--the organization in the

25

Bloomington community.

MR. BAYNARD: So we had one hundred and fifty people that had registered for that event. Again, that was a fair housing event for people with disabilities. We had a hundred and twelve people actually in attendance. We got—in response to our survey about how people felt about the event, we got a pretty positive responses, of anywhere from—out of a five—point scale responses ranging from 3.87 to 4.13. On an average, there were—that was not a bad turnout response there. The comments, positive and negative, were what I considered in the future.

On April 18 last--actually this Monday we were in Terre Haute, in partnership with the Terre Haute Housing Program--or the Terre Haute Human Relations Commission; also with the assistance of ICEA Fair Housing Authority.

In the morning we had a breakfast and a lunch there. We had about forty-two people in attendance, and got some information about the local fair housing, sort of a local subsidized housing conference. And we also received information about tenement laws, and housing for people with disabilities.

Not a bad turnout there. We got some good

input and kits, and press coverage from that event out of starting and development of the Terre Haute agency. And they got responses useful for raising awareness in that community.

Also, the following day Dave Duvall was in for the Governor's office. That agency had I believe issued a proclamation of Human Rights Day as a part of the Indiana State University Human Rights Day.

Coming up next Friday, we will meet in Gary for our all-day event dealing with Fair Housing,

Employment, and Education topics, also in accordance with IHCEA. I'm not sure what the-- We did have online registration, and of course I can't tell you right now what that is and how many people we have registered, but I think it's quite a good number, and we're comfortable at this point.

Again, we will be having breakfast, lunch, and also a reception there at the Genesis Center. And we will have a three-hour CLE in the morning as a part of that. We hope to get some attorneys present, talking about fair housing and educational opportunity.

That's all on our programing events, so far.

What's coming up next will be the Holocaust, at the end of May, at the Capitol. We're going to be working with the Indiana Consortium of Human Rights

Agencies, that put on the annual conference, that this year will be in Fort Wayne. That would be on the 14th of June.

Just a brief legal update. I do want to update you on one particular case. This is in Hamilton County, a housing case that was—where the respondent elected to have it remain in state court. That was Claims [phonetic] versus Freedom Mortgage, dealing with different credit score requirements for citizens and noncitizens.

We did have oral arguments on the defendant's motion to dismiss back in February, I think, and the judge did deny their motion to dismiss, so that's still—we are still in the game there, still kind of a difficult argument we face, but we will proceed. And we have made an offer of settlement in hopes that they will change their policy and also provide some remedy to the complainant. We haven't heard back yet on that, whether they are willing to do that. If they're not willing to change their policy, I imagine we will proceed until we have an argument to be heard in the state court.

That's all I have.

MR. CARTER: Questions?

Any announcements?

Okay. Please observe the next meeting date, and please don't leave before you ascertain that there are no signatures that -- they will be needed, and signature required of us. And otherwise, we are adjourned. [The meeting adjourned at 12:13 p.m.]

STATE OF INDIANA]
COUNTY OF MARION]

CERTIFICATE:

I, DAVID R. OESTERREICH, the undersigned Court
Reporter and Notary Public residing and maintaining offices
in the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, do hereby certify:

That at the time and place described above in this transcript I reported to the best of my ability in machine shorthand all of the words spoken by all parties in attendance during the course of the subject proceedings, including objections, if any, made by all counsel present;

That I later reduced my shorthand notes into the foregoing typewritten transcript form, which typewritten transcript is a true record of the testimony and/or statements given by those individuals indicated herein;

That I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or an employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have affixed my Notarial Seal and subscribed my signature below on this 11th day of May,

David R. Oesterreich

Notary Public

County of residence: Marion

My commission expires August 28, 2016

[SEAL]