STATE OF CONNECTICUT
COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES
OFFICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

INDEX OF DECISIONS AND RULINGS OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS REFEREES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section

I.	Subject matter index	Page 2
II.	Decisions/rulings listed alphabetically by complainant	Page 50
III.	Decisions/rulings listed alphabetically by respondent	Page 136
IV.	Decisions/rulings listed alphabetically by referee	Page 220

Sections II, III and IV include a brief summary of the decision/ruling.

I. Subject matter index

42 U.S.C. § 1981
Andrees, JoAnn Andrees v. Raymond & Sylvia Rinaldi 0650116
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to dismiss)

42 U.S.C. § 1982
Andrees, JoAnn Andrees v. Raymond & Sylvia Rinaldi 0650116
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to dismiss)
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(final decision)

42 U.S.C. § 3617
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to dismiss)
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(final decision)

180-Day Rule
Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield. 9420437
Caruso, Jr., John v. Western Connecticut State University 0620214
(motion to dismiss, 3/18/09)
Clements, Joyce v. Town of Brookfield 9620571
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education. 0420409
D'Angelo, Edward v. University of Bridgeport 9520184, 9520185, 9520186
Feroleto, Salvatore v. Dept. of Mental Retardation 0510140
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (motion to dismiss) 0520402
Morales, Lourdes v Trinity College 1110162
Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center 1330398
Staszewski, Mark v Town of Wallingford 1030290
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

Adverse Employment Action
Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505
(appeal dismissed)
Carretero, Stefan v. Hartford Public Schools 0310481
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482
(appeal dismissed)

Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (motion to dismiss) 0220394

After Acquired Evidence

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield (motion to preclude evidence unknown to the decision maker, 6/30/09) 0620142

Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield (motion to preclude evidence unknown to the decision maker, 6/30/09) 0620141

Age Discrimination

Alexsavich, Bruce & Ronald Ferguson v. Pratt & Whitney Aircraft 9330373, 9330374

Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2021) 0840032

Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield. 9420437

Clements, Joyce v. Town of Brookfield 9620571

DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (07/03/2013) 0920414 (1120319)

DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (09/19/2014) 0920414

Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2018) 0840162

Esposito, Armando v. City of New London 9340530

Flood, Robert v. American Can Company 8220420

Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services. 0020220

Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650

Kaplan, David v AFSCME Council #4 121003

Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden 9730288

Kitchens, John v Specialty Transportation 1010206

Lohr, Grace v Greenwich Bd of Education 1220147

Maier, Martin H. v. City of Norwalk 9320024

Maier, Martin H. v. Norwalk Municipal Employees Assoc. 9320026

McKinney, Kirk v Town of Glastonbury Fire Dept. 1140156

Milton, Michele v. Pulte Homes, Inc. 0630188 (appeal withdrawn)

Perry, Corrine v Dept. of Public Safety 0830218

Rajtar, Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield (final decision) 0510115 (appeal withdrawn)

Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124 (appeal dismissed)

Schopick, Andrew v. Nutmeg Securities, et al. 1123092, 1120439, 1120440

Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley 0840243

Stephenson, Arline v Webster Bank (two motions/rulings) 1110235

Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies 0510366

Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031

Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc. 1110081

Whitney, Robert v. Regal Stageways Limousines 0630256

Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley 0840008

Aiding and Abetting

Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2021) 0840032
Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2018) 0840162
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain (appeal dismissed) 9810482
Schopick, Andrew v. Nutmeg Securities, et al. 1123092, 1120439, 1120440
Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley 0840243
Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031
Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley 0840008

Ancestry Discrimination

Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505 (appeal dismissed)
Carver, Monica v. Drawbridge Inn Restaurant 9940179
Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno 0940298
Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash 0330082
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Phan, Khoa v Hartford Police 1210181 (appeal pending)
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 9910114

Application for Position of Employment

Bernd, Robert (9710052*); Bielanski, John* (9710053*) & Perry, Richard* (9710063*) v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp*
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273 (appeal withdrawn)
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650 (appeal withdrawn)
Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health 9710032 (appeal dismissed)
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124 (appeal dismissed)

Arbitration

Benjamin, Uel v. Mediplex of Greater Hartford 9910193
Dexter, Frank v. Dept. of Correction 0320165
Friedman, Sharon v. , Office of the Comptroller 0110195
Gyurko, Nancy v City of Torrington (Final decision 1/26/00; Supplement decision 7/13/01) 9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Rajtar, Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield (motion to dismiss) 0510115

Rajtar, *Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield* (Final decision) 0510115
(appeal withdrawn)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577

Arthritis
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163

Asthma
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163

Associational discrimination
Gallant, Michelle v. Torrad Assoc. LLC 1830431

Attorneys
Ferri, Susan v Darien Barber Shop 0520471
(motion to dismiss, 4/15/08)
Ratner, Ira v. Home & Life Security, Inc. 9930246
Standard, Tracy A. v. Esposito Design Associates, Inc 0820445.
(objection to defendant corporation proceeding pro se)

Attorney's Fees
Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)
Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Caggiano, Caterina v. Doreen Rockhead 0450017
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski 9710196, 9710197
Daniels, Jeffrey v Andre Ruellan 0550012
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. (final decision) 0420438
DiMicco, Rosa v Neil Roberts, Inc. (reconsideration) 0420438
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury. 9530587
(appeal withdrawn)
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250114
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Lopez, Patricia v Subway Stratford LLC 1120261
Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard 0550113
Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba 0450057
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)
Thompson, Nicole v Marc & Marie Pennino and John & Karen Bauco 0450008
(appeal withdrawn)
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)
Weller-Bajrami v. Lawrence Crest Cooperative, Inc. 99500095, 9950096

Authority to Dismiss

Blake, Lugenia v. Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut 9530630
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores 9510617
Negron, Lishka v. DSMA Enterprises 0110448
Nicolosi, Patricia v. Johnny's Pizza 9840466
Onoh, Mystraine v. Sterling, Inc. 9620499
Ratner, Ira v. Home & Life Security, Inc. 9930246

Backpay

Agvent, Rosa Maria v. Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Comp. Engin. Tech. 0020042
Brelig, Diana Lee v. F&L Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse Restaurant 9540683
Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171 (appeal withdrawn)
Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck 8330054
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
Doe (1993) Jane, v. Ice Cream Delight 9310191
Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury 9530587 (appeal withdrawn)
Gomez, Isabel v. United Security, Inc. 9930490 (appeal dismissed)
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273 (appeal withdrawn)
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650
Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health 9710032 (appeal dismissed)
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039 (appeal dismissed)
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc. 0440130 (stipulated agreement on appeal)
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc. 9920353
Samuel, Henrietta Lorraine Stevens v. Pond Point Health Care Center d/b/a Lexington Health Care 0230332
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124 (appeal dismissed)
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041 (appeal dismissed)
Slootskin, Inessa v. John Brown Engineers & Construction, Inc. 9320176
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions 0130212

Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc. 0420316
Williams, Robert v. M.N.S. Corporation 0010124

Bell's Palsy
Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459

Bipolar disorder
Recupero, Guy v. L.G. Defelice, Inc. 0530022

Bifurcated Proceedings
Alexsavich, Bruce & Ronald Ferguson v. Pratt & Whitney Aircraft 9330373, 9330374

Bona Fide Occupational Qualification (BFOQ)
Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227
Esposito, Armando v. City of New London 9340530
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650 (appeal withdrawn)
Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden 9730288
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
McKinney, Kirk v Town of Glastonbury Fire Dept. 1140156

Cancer
Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227

Carpal Tunnel Syndrome
Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9530477

Cat's paw theory of causation
Perry, Corrine v Dept. of Public Safety 0830218

Chief Human Rights Referee
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction (8/20/99) 9740163

Circumstantial evidence
Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505 (appeal dismissed)
Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash 0330082

Collateral Estoppel
Blinkoff, Holly v. City of Torrington 9530406 (remanded by Court of Appeals)
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield 0620142
(motion to preclude relitigation of facts and legal issues, 6/30/09)
Carey, Edward J. v. Imagineers, LLC 9850104

Duncan, Clive v CT Trane 0410319
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield 0620141
(motion to preclude relitigation of facts and legal issues, 6/30/09)
Perreira, Bhagmattie v Yale New Haven Hospital 1430048
Rajtar, Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield (motion to dismiss) 0510115
Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7 0130607

Collective bargaining agreement
O'Halloran, Josephine v. Town of Fairfield 0620146
(appeal dismissed)

Concurrent Jurisdiction
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. 9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)

Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act
Clark, Jeffrey v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9830599
(appeal dismissed)
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept. 9710685, 9710637
(remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Esposito, Armando v. City of New London 9340530
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Mather, Jayantha v Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)

Constructive Discharge
Doe, Jane v. Claywell Electric 0510199
Maher, Stacy v. New Britain Transportation Co. 0330303
Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services 9940089
(appeal withdrawn)
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions 0130212
Treacy, Kathy v Vitas Innovative Hospice Care 1320021

Continuance
Smith, Eunice v. Dept. of Correction 9710718

Continuing Violation
Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield 9420437
Clements, Joyce v. Town of Brookfield 9620571
Feroleto, Salvatore v. Dept. of Mental Retardation 0510140
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)

Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (motion to dismiss) 0520402
Magda, Muriel v. Diageo North America 0420213
Staszewski, Mark v Town of Wallingford 1030290
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

Corporate self-representation

Standard, Tracy A. v. Esposito Design Associates, Inc. 0820445
(objection to defendant corporation proceeding pro se)

Credibility

Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002
(final decision)
Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno 0940298

Damages

Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)
Agvent, Rosa Maria v. Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Comp. Engin. Tech. 0020042
Brelig, Diana Lee v. F&L Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse Restaurant 9540683
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002
(final decision)
Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield 9420437
Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227
Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski 9710196, 9710197
Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck 8330054
Doe (1993) Jane, v. Ice Cream Delight 9310191
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Gomez, Isabel v. United Security, Inc. 9930490
(appeal dismissed)
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650
(appeal withdrawn)
Hartling, Judy v. Jeffrey Carfi 0550116
Helliger, Patricia v. Avalon Properties 9730397
Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health 9710032
(appeal dismissed)
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039
(appeal dismissed)
McNeal-Morris, Malisa v. Czeslaw Gnat 9950108
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc. 9920353
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243

Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041 (appeal dismissed)
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Turner, Laurie v. Ritz Realty, Quality Towing 9920135, 9920136
Williams, Robert v. M.N.S. Corporation 0010124

Decision maker in the same protected class
Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2021) 0840032
Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031

Declaratory Ruling
Amos, Barry E. v. Town of West Hartford 9910041, 9910198, 9910199, 9910200, 9910201, 9910202
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores 9510617
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction (8/20/99) 9740163

De Novo Review
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. 0430307 (motion to amend)
Bernd, Robert (9710052*); Bielanski, John* (9710053*) & Perry, Richard (*9710063*) v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.*
Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors 0030569, 0030586, 0030587
Charette, Lisa v. Department of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Magda, Muriel v. Diageo North America 0420213
Okonkwo, Francis v. Bidwell Healthcare Center 9940144
Perry, Claude v. Town of Ansonia 9730481
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority 9710713

Depositions
Czuchra, Roger A. v. Pace Motor Lines (10/22/10) 0820039

Direct Evidence
Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505 (appeal dismissed)

Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash 0330082
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (ruling on motion to dismiss) 0220394
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 9910114
Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies 0510366
Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc. 1110081

Disability Discrimination

Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227
Charette, Lisa v. Department of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Clark, Jeffrey v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9830599
(appeal dismissed)
Cosme, Edgardo v. Sunrise Estates, LLC 0510210
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
George, Thomas v Town of West Hartford 0910466
Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9530477
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
Kelly, Brian v. City of New Britain 0210359
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482
(appeal dismissed)
Leonard, Cynthia v City of Waterbury 1630341
(appeal pending)
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Melvin, Roderick v. Yale University 0230320
Miranda, Andrew v New Haven Bd of Educ 1030148
Navarro, Edwin v. Hospital for Special Care 9710678
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Planas, Felix v Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis 1210127
Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services 9940089 (appeal withdrawn)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority 9710713
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)
Staszewski, Mark v Town of Wallingford 1030290
Smalls, Kelly v. Waterbury Masonry & Foundation, Inc. 0330386
Toepelt, Rochelle v. Nailtique aks Nailtique, Inc. 0720118
Treacy, Kathy v Vitas Innovative Hospice Care 1320021
Turner, Tammy v Dept. of Developmental Services 1010190

Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)
Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc. 1110081

Disclosure of medical records

Pappy, John v. Southern Connecticut State University 0730288
(motion to compel)

Disclosure of personnel records

Azam, Qazi v. Yale University (motion to compel) 0430623
Garceau, Mary Beth v. Yale University (motion to compel) 0530073
Langan, Kevin v. RCK Corp. dba JP Dempsey's 0730256
(motion to compel)
Pappy, John v. Southern Connecticut State University 0730288
(motion to compel)

Discovery

Benjamin, Uel v. Mediplex of Greater Hartford 9910193
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002
Green, Devon v. SNET Co. 9420217
Isler, Jacqueline v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9730024
Langan, Kevin v. RCK Corp. dba JP Dempsey's 0730256
(motion to compel)
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039
(appeal dismissed)
O'Neill, Eileen v. J.P. Dempsey's, Inc. 9430534
Vendryes, Kathrine v. Roadway Package Systems, Inc. 9830539

Discriminatory public advertising

Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250114

Disqualification of opposing counsel

Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors 0030569, 0030586, 0030587

EEOC Regulations

Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)

Emotional Distress

Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. (12/12/05, motion
for sanctions) 9830294
Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Bentley-Meunier, LaToya v DEKK Group dba Dunkin Donuts 1140322
Braffith, Samuel v. Peter Pan Bus Lines 0540183
(motion in limine, 11/13/09)
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002
(final decision)
Caggiano, Caterina v. Doreen Rockhead 0450017
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield 0620142
motion to preclude evidence of emotional distress damages, 6/30/09)
Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno 0940298
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski 9710196, 9710197

Correa, Jocelin v. La Casona Restaurant 0710004
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171
(appeal withdrawn)
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
Doe, Jane v. Claywell Electric 0510199
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield 0620141
(motion to preclude evidence of emotional distress damages, 6/30/09)
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250114
Hartling, Judy v. Jeffrey Carfi 0550116
Helliger, Patricia v. Avalon Properties 9730397
Hogan, Ashley v H&H Promotions, Inc. 1720211
Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon (06/12/2017) 1550288
(appeal pending)
Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon (08/17/2018, on remand) 1550288
(appeal pending)
Jackson, Gloria v. Debra Lutkowski and Paul Pixbey 0950094 & 0950095
Lauray, Mark v City Hall Café 1530333
Lawton, Kimberly v. Chad Jansen 0550135
Leonard, Cynthia v City of Waterbury 1630341
(appeal pending)
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Lopez, Patricia v Subway Stratford LLC 1120261
McNeal-Morris, Malisa v. Czeslaw Gnat 9950108
Miranda, Andrew v New Haven Bd of Educ 1030148
Mohammed, Saeed v Norwalk Economic Opportunity Now Inc. 1420210
Phan, Khoa v Hartford Police 1210181
(appeal pending)
Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard 0550113
Punzalan, Roxanne v Zheng Trust LLC
dba Koto Japanese Restaurant 1140112

Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba 0450057
Saex, Randall v. Wireless Retail, Inc. 0410175
Scott, Juliet v. Robert Jemison 9950020
Swindell, Jennifer v. Lighthouse Inn 0840137
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc. 0420316
Thompson, Nicole v Marc & Marie Pennino and John & 0450008
Karen Bauco (appeal withdrawn)
Toepelt, Rochelle v. Nailtique aks Nailtique, Inc. 0720118
Turner, Laurie v. Ritz Realty, Quality Towing 9920135, 9920136
Urban, Stephen v United Pet Supply, Inc. 0830309
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)
Weller-Bajrami v. Lawrence Crest Cooperative, Inc. 99500095, 995009

Employment relationship

Puryear, Brenda v Echo Hose Ambulance and the City of Shelton 1130518

Equal Pay Act

Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington 9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(1/26/01; Supplemental 7/13/01)
Maher, Stacy v. New Britain Transportation Co. 0330303
Melvin, Roderick v. Yale University 0230320
Milton, Michele v. Pulte Homes, Inc., 0630188
(appeal withdrawn)

Equitable Tolling

Feroleto, Salvatore v. Dept. of Mental Retardation 0510140
Morales, Lourdes v Trinity College 1110162
Perri, Dennis v George Peluso (motion to dismiss) 0750113
Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center (motion to dismiss) 1330398

Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

ERISA

Warner, Stephen v NERAC, Inc. 0840031

Essential Job Functions

Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227
Charette, Lisa v. Department of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
Clark, Jeffrey v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9830599
(appeal dismissed)
Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9530477
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (final decision) 0520402
(on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services 9940089
(appeal withdrawn)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority 9710713
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)

Exclusion of evidence and testimony

Matson, Joel v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addictions Services 9930311

Executive Director

DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores 9510617

Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction (8/20/99) 9740163

Exhaustion of administrative remedies

Carretero, Stefan v. Hartford Public Schools. 0310481

Failure to Answer

Samuel, Henrietta Lorraine Stevens v. Pond Point Health Care Center d/b/a Lexington Health Care 0230332

Failure to Appear

Aguiar, Deborah v. Nancy Frenzilli 9850105 (on remand, stipulated agreement)

Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co. 9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069

Negron, Lishka v. DSMA Enterprises 0110448

Nemeth, Sandor v Wesport Big & Tall, Inc. 0920337 (remand by agreement)

Nicolosi, Patricia v. Johnny's Pizza 9840466

Samuel, Henrietta Lorraine Stevens v. Pond Point Health Care Center d/b/a Lexington Health Care 0230332

Soulemani, Arouna v. Mark Ash 0230045

Tavares, Cori v. Sam's Club, Wal-Mart Stores Inc. 9730092 (vacated on appeal by stipulated judgment)

Failure to Comply with Order re: Motion to compel production of documents

Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. 9830294 (12/12/05, motion for sanctions)

Crebase, John v. Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171

Matson, Joel v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addictions Services 9930311

Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge Building 0640147 (motion for sanctions, 7/1/09)

Failure to comply with Order re: filing revised complaint

Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection (12/12/2018) 0910275 (appeal pending)

Failure to Cooperate

Allen, Sheila v. Pollack's 9710692

Cuffee, Tampiepko Tion v. Nine West Group, Inc. 9720038

Leslie, Willie v. City of New Haven 9830575

Nicolosi, Patricia v. Johnny's Pizza 9840466

Ratner, Ira v. Home & Life Security, Inc. 9930246

Failure to state a claim

Browne, Philip v Dept of Correction (11/26/2013) (corrected ruling) 1130416

Demmerle, Mark v New England Stair Co. 1730020
Gallant, Michelle v Torrand Assoc. LLC 1830431
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to dismiss)
Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection 0910275
(motion to dismiss/motion to strike, 10/09/2018)
(appeal pending)

Fair Housing Act
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to dismiss)
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(final decision)

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. 9830294
(Amended ruling: the respondent's motion to vacate)

Federal Court
Carey, Edward J. v. Imagineers, LLC 9850104

Federal Regulations
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061

Firefighters
Esposito, Armando v. City of New London 9340530

First Amendment, United States Constitution
Couture*, Alan v. Waterbury Republican* 0630390
(motion to dismiss) (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Demmerle, Mark v New England Stair Co. 1730020
McDonald, Robert v. Waterbury Republican 0630389
(motion to dismiss) (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Sokolowski, Andrea J.R. v Trinity Christian School 1110391
(two motions to dismiss, two rulings)

Fourteenth Amendment, United State Constitution
Young, Claude v. City of Stamford Police Dept. 0720418
(motion to dismiss, 11/18/09)

Fringe Benefits

Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck 8330054
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171
(appeal withdrawn)
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650
(appeal withdrawn)
Recupero, Guy v. L.G. Defelice, Inc. 0530022

Front Pay

Cosme, Edgardo v. Sunrise Estates, LLC 0510210
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171
(appeal withdrawn)
Doe (1993) Jane v. Ice Cream Delight 9310191
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Recupero, Guy v. L.G. Defelice, Inc. 0530022
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc. 9920353
Saex, Randall v. Wireless Retail, Inc. 0410175
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Slootskin, Inessa v. John Brown Engineers & Construction, Inc. 9320176
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions 0130212
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc. 0420316

Gender/sex Discrimination

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield 0620142
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept. 9710685, 9710637
(remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Doe, Jane v. Claywell Electric 0510199
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield 0620141
Intagliata, Debra J. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9740381
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482
(appeal dismissed)
Maher, Stacy v. New Britain Transportation Co. 0330303
Milton, Michele v. Pulte Homes, Inc., 0630188
(appeal withdrawn)
O'Halloran, Josephine v. Town of Fairfield 0620146
(appeal dismissed)
Senra, Susan v Groton Open MRI LLC 1140018

Gender dysphoria/gender identity disorder

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Peterson, Dana v. City of Hartford, Police Dept. 0410049

General Statutes § 4-142

Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 0710348
(motion to dismiss, 05/19/09)

General Statutes § 4-177 (c)

Matson, Joel v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addictions Services 9930311

General Statutes § 4-181a

Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden (5/2/00) 9730288

General Statutes § 5-276

Friedman, Sharon v. Office of the State Comptroller 0110195

General Statutes § 7-430

Esposito, Armando v. City of New London 9340530
Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden 9730288

General Statutes § 16-343

Ocana, Holger v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630645
(motion to dismiss) (appeal dismissed)
Vidal, Robert v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630646
(motion to dismiss) (appeal dismissed)

General Statutes § 16-344

Ocana, Holger v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630645
(motion to dismiss) (appeal dismissed)
Vidal, Robert v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630646
(motion to dismiss) (appeal dismissed)

General Statutes § 31-128f

Azam, Qazi v. Yale University (motion to compel) 0430623
Garceau, Mary Beth v. Yale University (motion to compel) 0530073
Langan, Kevin v. RCK Corp. dba JP Dempsey's 0730256
(motion to compel)

General Statutes § 46a-51(17)

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

General Statutes § 46a-51(20)

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

General Statutes § 46a-54

Genovese, Lisa v. Ultimate Billiards 0530337

General Statutes § 46a-58 (a)

Braffith, Samuel v. Peter Pan Bus Lines 0540183 (motion in limine, 11/13/09)
Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center 0610446 (motion to dismiss, 7/22/08)
Correa, Jocelin v. La Casona Restaurant 0710004
Cosme, Edgardo v. Sunrise Estates, LLC 0510210
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171 (appeal withdrawn)
Dexter, Frank v. Dept. of Correction 0320165
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. 0 420438
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (07/03/2013) 0920414 (1120319)
Duarte, James v. Hamilton Standard 9610553 (but see *Scarfo*)
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Ellis John v. ACE International (Motion to dismiss, 9/13/10) 0620473
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Genovese, Lisa v. Ultimate Billiards 0530337
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (final decision) 0520402 (on appeal, stipulated judgment)
McWeeny, Robert v. City of Hartford 0410314 (appeal dismissed)
Pappy, John v. Southern Conn. State Univ. (Mot. to dismiss) 0730288
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc. 0440130 (stipulated agreement while on appeal)
Robinson, Patricia v. Dept. of Mental Health 0630292 (motion to dismiss)
Saex, Randall v. Wireless Retail, Inc. 0410175
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577
Stevens, Lorraine v. Urban League 0010328
Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies 0510366
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc. 0420316
Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 0710348 (motion to dismiss, 05/19/09)

General Statutes §46a-60 (a) (1)

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
McWeeny, Robert v. City of Hartford 0410314
(appeal dismissed)
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)

General Statutes § 46a-60 (a) (4)

Blinkoff, Holly v City of Torrington (07/17/07) 9530406
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford 9710685, 9710637
Fire Dept. (remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc. 9920353
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243

General Statutes § 46a-60 (a) (5)

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

General Statutes § 46a-60 (a) (8)

Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243

General Statutes § 46a-60 (b) (1) (C)

Esposito, Armando v. City of New London 9340530
Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden 9730288

General Statutes § 46a-60 (b) (2)

Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield 9420437

General Statutes § 46a-64 – see public accommodation

General Statutes § 46a-64c

Ali, Liaquiat v Bridgeport, City of, (motion to dismiss) 0750131 & 0750132
Andrees, JoAnn Andrees v. Raymond & Sylvia Rinaldi 0650116
Aguiar, Deborah v. Nancy Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)
Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co 9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002 (final decision)
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061

Helliger, Patricia v. Avalon Properties 9730397
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba 0450057
Thompson, Nicole v Marc & Marie Pennino and John & Karen Bauco 0450008 (appeal withdrawn)
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047 (following appeal, stipulated judgment)

General Statutes § 46a-64c (a) (9)
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002 (final decision)
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080 (motion to dismiss)
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080 (final decision)

General Statutes § 46a-70 (a)
Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center 0610446 (motion to dismiss, 7/22/08)
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 0710348 (motion to dismiss, 05/19/09)

General Statutes Sec. 46a-71
Vargas, Alsenet v Dept of Correction 1110437

General Statutes § 46a-75
Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven Bd. of Ed. 9830205 (on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. (5/31/00) 9830294 (rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)

General Statutes § 46a-77
Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center 0610446 (motion to dismiss, 7/22/08)

General Statutes § 46a-81a
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

General Statutes § 46a-81c

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482 (appeal dismissed)

Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163 (on appeal, remanded by stipulation)

General Statutes § 46a-81m

Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven Bd. of Ed. 9830205 (on appeal, stipulated judgment)

General Statutes § 46a-81p

Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163 (on appeal, remanded by stipulation)

General Statues § 46a-82

Bernd, Robert (9710052*); Bielanski, John* (9710053) *& Perry, Richard* (9710063*) v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp*

General Statues § 46a-82 (a)

McWeeny, Robert v. City of Hartford 0410314 (appeal dismissed)

General Statutes § 46a-82e (a)

Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. 0210354

General Statutes § 46a-83

Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. 0430307 (motion to amend)

Walley, Terry v. Dept. of Correction 0020470

General Statutes § 46a-83 (f)

Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. 0210354

General Statutes § 46a-84 (a)

Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. 0210354

General Statutes § 46a-84 (b)

Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. 0210354

Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center (motion to dismiss, 7/22/08) 0610446

General Statutes 46a-85 (b)

Rajtar, Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield (motion to dismiss) 0510115
Rajtar, *Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield* (final decision) 0510115
(appeal withdrawn)

General Statutes § 46a-86

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

General Statutes § 46a-86 (b)

Mejias, David v. Mortgage Company of America 0639976
Rhodes, Kevin v. Mortgage Company of America 0630040

General Statutes § 46a-86 (c)

Braffith, Samuel v. Peter Pan Bus Lines (motion in limine, 11/13/09) 0540183
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171
(appeal withdrawn)
Hartling, Judy v. Jeffrey Carfi 0550116
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard 0550113
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc. 0420316

General Statutes § 46a-101 (d)

Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut 9730257

Hearing in Damages

Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)
Agvent, Rosa Maria v. Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Comp. Engin. Tech. 0020042
Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Bentley-Meunier, LaToya v DEKK Group dba Dunkin Donuts 1140322
Brelig, Diana Lee v. F&L Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse Restaurant 9540683
Caggiano, Caterina v. Doreen Rockhead 0450017
Correa, Jocelin v. La Casona Restaurant 0710004
DeBarros, Paula v Hartford Roofing, Co., Inc. 0430162
Daniels, Elbert v. U. S. Security Associates, Inc. 0430286
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
Doe, Jane v. Claywell Electric 0510199
Doe (1993) Jane, v. Ice Cream Delight 9310191
Downes, Elizabeth v. zUniversity.com 0210366
Garcia, Dionne v CT Family Care LLC 1340202
Genovese, Lisa v. Ultimate Billiards 0530337
Gillmore, Alexis v. Mothers Works, Inc. 0330195

Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury	9530587 (appeal withdrawn)
Gomez, Isabel v. United Security, Inc.	9930490 (appeal dismissed)
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus	0250114
Hartling, Judy v. Carfi, Jeffrey	0550116
Hogan, Ashley v H&H Promotions, Inc.	1720211
Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon	1550288 (appeal pending)
Jackson, Gloria v. Debra Lutkowski and Paul Pixbey	0950094 & 0950095
Lauray, Mark v City Hall Café	1530333
Lawton, Kimberly v. Chad Jansen	0550135
Leslie, Willie v. City of New Haven	9830575
Lopes, Elizabeth v. Comfort Suites	0540252
Lopez, Patricia v Subway Stratford LLC	1120261
Masterson, Maria v Polish American Citizen's Club	1030184
McNeal-Morris, Malisa v. Czeslaw Gnat	9950108
Mohammed, Saeed v Norwalk Economic Opportunity Now Inc.	1420210
Morales-Martinez, Robinson v Smart Home Preservation	1730254
Mejias, David v. Mortgage Company of America	0639976
Peters, Wendy Ann v Polish American Citizen's Club	1220183
Pullicino, Laura v Pelham Sloane, Inc.	0920214
Punzalan, Roxanne v Zheng Trust LLC dba Koto Japanese Restaurant	1140112
Ramirez, Ezequiel v Smart Home Preservation	1730247
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc.	0440130 (stipulated agreement while on appeal)
Recupero, Guy v. L.G. Defelice, Inc.	0530022
Rhodes, Kevin v. Mortgage Company of America	0630040
Rosado, Nestor v. United Parcel Service, Inc.	0020469
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc.	9920353
Saex, Randall v. Wireless Retail, Inc.	0410175
Sanchez, Maria v. Atlantic Communications, Corp.	0430462
Scott, Juliet v. Robert Jemison	9950020
Sloss, George T. v. Ed-Mor Electric Company	9930221
Smalls, Kelly v. Waterbury Masonry & Foundation, Inc.	0330386
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions	0130212
Soulemani, Arouna v. Mark Ash	0230045
Swindell, Jennifer v. Lighthouse Inn	0840137
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc.	0420316
Tineo, Leonicio v Smart Choice Preservation	1730253
Toepelt, Rochelle v. Nailtique aks Nailtique, Inc.	0720118
Turner, Laurie v. Ritz Realty, Quality Towing	9920135, 9920136

Urban, Stephen v United Pet Supply, Inc. 0830309
Volpintesta, Lou v. International Athletic Association of Basketball Officials 9910120
Weller-Bajrami v. Lawrence Crest Cooperative, Inc. 99500095, 9950096
Whitney, Robert v. Regal Stageways Limousines 0630256
Williams, Robert v. M.N.S. Corporation 0010124

Home Rule
Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden 9730288

Hostile Housing Environment
Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon (06/12/2017) 1550288 (appeal pending)
Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon (08/17/2018, on remand) 1550288 (appeal pending)
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark ` 9810387
Lawton, Kimberly v. Chad Jansen 0550135
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom (motion to dismiss) 0750080
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom (final decision) 0750080

Hostile Work Environment
Dako-Smith, Frederica v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services 0020228, 0220142 (appeal dismissed)
Dexter, Frank v. Dept. of Correction 0320165
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Melvin, Roderick v. Yale University 0230320
Milton, Michele v. Pulte Homes, Inc. 0630188 (appeal withdrawn)
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions 0130212

Housing Discrimination
Andrees, JoAnn Andrees v. Raymond & Sylvia Rinaldi 0650116
Aguiar, Deborah v. Nancy and Ralph Frenzilli 9850105 (on remand, withdrawn)
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson (final decision) 0750001, 0750002
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski 9710196, 9710197
Daniels, Jeffrey v Andre Ruellan 0550012
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Hartling, Judy v. Jeffrey Carfi 0550116
Helliger, Patricia v. Avalon Properties 9730397
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom (motion to dismiss) 0750080

Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard 0550113
Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba 0450057
Thompson, Nicole v Marc & Marie Pennino and John & Karen Bauco 0450008 (appeal withdrawn)
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047 (following appeal, stipulated judgment)
Weller-Bajrami v. Lawrence Crest Cooperative, Inc. 99500095, 9950096

Individual Liability

DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482 (appeal dismissed)
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions 0130212

Instatement

Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273 (appeal withdrawn)
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)

Interest

Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli 9850105 (on remand, withdrawn)
Agvent, Rosa Maria v. Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Comp. Engin. Tech. 0020042
Brelig, Diana Lee v. F&L Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse Restaurant 9540683
Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield 9420437
Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck 8330054
Doe (1993) Jane, v. Ice Cream Delight 9310191
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury 9530587 (appeal withdrawn)
Gomez, Isabel v. United Security, Inc. 9930490 (appeal dismissed)
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650 (appeal withdrawn)
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health 9710032 (appeal dismissed)
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9820039 (appeal dismissed)
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc. 9920353

Samuel, Henrietta Lorraine Stevens v. Pond Point Health Care Center d/b/a Lexington Health Care 0230332
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124 (appeal dismissed)
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041 (appeal dismissed)
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions 0130212
Williams, Robert v. M.N.S. Corporation 0010124

Interrogatories

Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002
Genovese, Lisa v. Ultimate Billiards 0530337
Gill, Rosemarie v. Hartford Public Schools 0010417
Green, Devon v. SNET Co. 9420217
Isler, Jacqueline v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9730024
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039 (appeal dismissed)
O'Neill, Eileen v. J.P. Dempsey's, Inc. 9430534
Vendryes, Kathrine v. Roadway Package Systems, Inc. 9830539

Interviews

Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)

Job related

Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford 0520402 (on appeal, stipulated judgment)

Job Study

Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington 9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278 (final decision 1/26/00; Supplemental 7/13/01)

Jurisdiction – Federal Claims

Bernd, Robert (9710052*); Bielanski, John* (9710053*) & Perry, Richard* (9710063) *v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.*
Duarte, James v. Hamilton Standard 9610553
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (07/03/2013) 0920414 (1120319)
*DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (*07/15/2013) 0920414 (1120319)
Robinson, Patricia v. Dept. of Mental Health 0630292 (motion to dismiss)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577

Jurisdiction—Minimum Number of Employees

DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen (8/17/99) 9830057
*DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (*07/15/2013) 0920414 (1120319)
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039
(appeal dismissed)

Jurisdiction—No Reasonable Cause

Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. 0430307
(motion to amend)
Bernd, Robert (9710052*); Bielanski, John* (9710053*) & Perry, Richard* (9710063) *v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.*
Charette, Lisa v. Dept. of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
Magda, Muriel v. Diageo North America 0420213
Okonkwo, Francis v. Bidwell Healthcare Center 9940144
Parker-Bair, Florence v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles 0510486
motion to dismiss, 12/15/09)
Perry, Claude v. Town of Ansonia 9730481
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority 9710713
Walley, Terry v. Dept. of Correction 0020470

Jurisdiction—Prior Arbitration

Benjamin, Uel v. Mediplex of Greater Hartford 9910193
Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington 9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(final decision 1/26/00; Supplemental 7/13/01)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577

Jurisdiction-Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Ali, Liaquiat v Bridgeport, City of, (motion to dismiss) 0750131 & 0750132
Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. 0210354
Ferri, Susan v Darien Barber Shop 0520471
(motion to dismiss, 4/15/08)
Ocana, Holger v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630645
(motion to dismiss) (appeal dismissed)
Perri, Dennis v George Peluso (motion to dismiss) 0750113
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)
Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection 0910275
(motion to dismiss/motion to strike, 10/09/2018)
Vidal, Robert v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630646
(motion to dismiss) (appeal dismissed)
Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 0710348
(motion to dismiss, 05/19/09)

Lawful source of income

Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 0750001, 0750002
(final decision)
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250114
Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard 0550113
Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba 0450057

License Requirement

Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)

Mandatory Retirement

Esposito, Armando v. City of New London 9340530
Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden 9730288
McKinney, Kirk v Town of Glastonbury Fire Dept. 1140156

Marital Status

Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)
Couture, Alan v. Waterbury Republican 0630390
(motion to dismiss) (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
McDonald, Robert v. Waterbury Republican 0630389
(motion to dismiss) (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
McWeeny, Robert v. City of Hartford 0410314
(appeal dismissed)

Mental disorder/disability

Miranda, Andrew v New Haven Bd of Educ 1030148
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Recupero, Guy v. L.G. Defelice, Inc. 0530022
Treacy, Kathy v Vitas Innovative Hospice Care 1320021
Turner, Tammy v Dept. of Developmental Services 1010190

Misnomers

DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Ferri, Susan v Darien Barber Shop
(motion to dismiss, 4/15/08) 0520471

Mitigation

Bentley-Meunier, LaToya v DEKK Group
dba Dunkin Donuts 1140322
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171
(appeal withdrawn)
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Lauray, Mark v City Hall Café 1530333
Masterson, Maria v Polish American Citizen's Club 1030184

Mohammed, Saeed v Norwalk Economic Opportunity Now Inc. 1420210
Morales-Martinez, Robinson v Smart Home Preservation 1730254
Peters, Wendy Ann v Polish American Citizen's Club 1220183
Pullicino, Laura v Pelham Sloane, Inc. 0920214
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Senra, Susan v Groton Open MRI LLC 1140018
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc. 0420316
Tineo, Leonicio v Smart Choice Preservation 1730253
Urban, Stephen v United Pet Supply, Inc. 0830309
Whitney, Robert v. Regal Stageways Limousines 0630256

Mixed motive
Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505
(appeal dismissed)
Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies 0510366

Motions for Articulation
Blinkoff Holly v. City of Torrington 9530406

Motions for directed verdict
Artis, Carnell v Kelly Services, C. Kostas and Covidien LP dba Covidien 1230079 (1230080, 1230184)

Motions for reconsideration
Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc. 1110081

Motions for Sanctions
Crebase, John v. Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. 9830294
(12/12/05, motion for sanctions)
Matson, Joel v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addictions Services 9930311
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge Building 0640147
(motion for sanctions, 7/1/09)
Rowe, CarolAnne v Allied World Assurance Co. 1810381
(12/29/21, motion for sanctions)

Motions for Summary Judgment
Barnes, Arnell v. Alan S. Goodman, Inc., 0710395
Blake, Lugenia v. Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut 9530630
Blinkoff Holly v. City of Torrington 9530406
(remanded by Court of Appeals)
Carretero, Stefan v. Hartford Public Schools. 0310481
Danner, Stephanie v ATOS IT Solutions and Services, Inc. 1730314
(on appeal, remanded)

Kelly, Brian v. City of New Britain 0210359
(ruling on a motion to dismiss)
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (motion to dismiss) 0220394
Perreira, Bhagmattie v Yale New Haven Hospital 1430048
Stephenson, Arline v Webster Bank (two rulings) 1110235

Motions in Limine
Braffith, Samuel v. Peter Pan Bus Lines 0540183
(motion in limine, 11/13/09)
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services 0220394

Motions to Amend – additional complainant
Rountree, Maria S. v. Seafood Peddler 9830387

Motions to Amend – additional protected basis
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. 0430307
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education. 0420409
Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut 9730257
(see motion to dismiss)
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge (03/03/09) 0640147
Walley, Terry v. Dept. of Correction 0020470

Motions to Amend – additional/correctly name the respondent
Abildgaard, William v. New Horizons Computer Learning Center 0110495
Davis, Keith A. v. Mama Bears LLC 0430103
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Kondratowicz, Stephen v. Pleasant Valley Mobile Home Park 0250051
L'Annunziata, Paul v. New Horizons Learning Center 0210153
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge (12/29/08) 0640147

Motions to Amend – additional statutory cite
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. 0430307
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education. 0420409
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut 9730257
(see motion to dismiss)
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge (03/03/09) 0640147
Tabatabai, Ahmadali v RainDance Technologies, Inc. 0830168
Walley, Terry v. Dept. of Correction 0020470

Motions to amend – release of jurisdiction

Taylor, Thaddeus v Salvation ARC 1010252

Motions to Compel

Azam, Qazi v Yale University 0430623
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. 0430307
(the commission's motion)
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. 0430307
(the respondent's motion)
Garceau, Mary Beth v. Yale University 0530073
Langan, Kevin v. RCK Corp. dba JP Dempsey's 0730256
Pappy, John v. Southern Connecticut State University 0730288
(medical records)

Motions to Dismiss

Ali, Liaquiat v Bridgeport, City of, 0750131 & 0750132
Allen, Sheila v. Pollack's 9710692
Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven 9830205
Bd. of Ed. (on appeal stipulated judgment)
Artis, Carnell v Kelly Services, C. Kostas and Covidien LP
dba Covidien 1230079 (1230080, 1230184)
Baker, Sandra v Hartford Public Schools 1310147
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. 9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. (12/12/05, motion for
sanctions) 9830294
Benjamin, Uel v. Mediplex of Greater Hartford 9910193
Bernd, Robert (9710052); *Bielanski, John* (9710053) *& Perry,* Richard (9710063) *v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp*
Blake, Lugenia v. Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut 9530630
Blinkoff Holly v. City of Torrington (05/10/04) 9530406
(remanded by Court of Appeals)
Blinkoff, Holly v City of Torrington (07/17/07) 9530406
Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services 0210354
Group, Inc.
Browne, Philip v Dept of Correction (11/26/2013) 1130416
Carretero, Stefan v. Hartford Public Schools. 0310481
Caruso, Jr., John v. Western Connecticut State 0620214
University (3/18/09)
Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors 0030569, 0030586, 0030587
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education. 0420409
Cuffee, Tampiepko Tion v. Nine West Group, Inc. 9720038
D'Angelo, Edward v. University of Bridgeport 9520184, 9520185, 9520186
Demmerle, Mark v New England Stair Co.
1730020
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen (2 separate motions) 9830057

Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut (2 separate motions) 9730257
Duarte, James v. Hamilton Standard 9610553
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (07/03/2013) 0920414 (1120319)
*DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. (*07/15/2013) 0920414 (1120319)
Ellis, John v. ACE International (09/13/10) 0620473
Ellis, John v. ACE International (10/25/10) 0620473
Ferri, Susan v Darien Barber Shop (4/15/08) 0520471
Feroleto, Salvatore v. CT Dept. of Mental Retardation 0510140
Friedman, Sharon v. Office of the State Comptroller 0110195
Gallant, Michelle v. Torrad Assoc. LLC. 1830431
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores (2 decisions) 9510617
Joiner, David v. H.E.R.E. Local 217 0410177
Kelly, Brian v. City of New Britain 0210359
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford 0520402
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Magda, Muriel v. Diageo North America 0420213
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Mayo, Alfred Parker v Bauer, Inc. 0831066
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
Moore, John v. Dept. of Children & Families 07310209
Morales, Lourdes v Trinity College 1110162

Nemeth, Sandor v Wesport Big & Tall, Inc. 0920337
(remand by agreement)
Negron, Lishka v. DSMA Enterprises 0110448
Nicolosi, Patricia v. Johnny's Pizza 9840466
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Okonkwo, Francis v. Bidwell Healthcare Center 9940144
Ocana, Holger v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630645
(appeal dismissed)
Onoh, Mystraine v. Sterling, Inc. 9620499
Pappy, John v. Southern Conn. State Univ. 0730288
Parker-Bair, Florence v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles 0510486
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services 0220394
Perri, Dennis v George Peluso 0750113
Perry, Claude v. Town of Ansonia 9730481
Rajtar, Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield 0510115
Ratner, Ira v. Home & Life Security, Inc. 9930246
Robinson, Patricia v. Dept. of Mental Health 0630292
Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center 1330398
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)
Sokolowski, Andrea J.R. v Trinity Christian School 1110391

Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7 0130607
Stevens, Lorraine v. Urban League 0010328
Tabatabai, Ahmadali v RainDance Technologies, Inc. 0830168
Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection (10/09/2018) 0910275
(appeal pending)
Vargas, Alsenet v Dept of Correction 1110437
Vidal, Robert v. Metro-North Railroad Co. 0630646
(appeal dismissed)
Warner, Stephen v NERAC, Inc. 0840031
Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 0710348
(05/19/09)
Young, Claude v. City of Stamford Police Dept. (11/18/09) 0720418

Motions to Open Default/public hearing

Aguiar, Deborah v. Nancy and Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, appeal withdrawn)
Brown, Kim v. Olsten Services, Inc. 9920046
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc. 0440130
(stipulated agreement while on appeal)

Motions to Reconsider/reconsideration of decision, reconsideration of ruling

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield 0620142
(motion to preclude evidence of emotional distress damages, 6/30/09)
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford 9710685, 9710637
Fire Dept.
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski (1/31) 9710196, 9710197
DiMicco, Rosa v Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield 0620141
(motion to preclude evidence of emotional distress damages, 6/30/09)
Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury 9530587
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc. 0440130
(stipulated agreement while on appeal)
Rajtar, Donald J., v. Town of Bloomfield. 0510115
(appeal withdrawn)
Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7 0130607
Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies 0510366
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc. (10/5/06) 0420316
Thompson, Nicole v. Marc & Marie Pennino 0450008
(appeal withdrawn)

Motions to Stay

Amos, Barry E. v. Town of West Hartford 9910041, 9910198, 910199, 9910200, 9910201, 9910202
Carey, Edward J. v. Imagineers, LLC 9850104
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen 9830057
Duncan, Clive v CT Trane 0410319
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores (9/1/99) 9510617
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction (8/20/99) 9740163
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc. 0440130 (stipulated agreement while on appeal)

Motions to Strike

Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co. 9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Browne, Philip v Dept of Correction (11/26/2013) 1130416

Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors 0030569, 0030586, 0030587
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (motion to dismiss) 0520402
Lorimer, Valerie v Southern CT State Univ 1230447
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (motion to dismiss) 0220394
Puryear, Brenda v Echo Hose Ambulance and the City of Shelton 1130518
Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center 1330398
Saraceno, Cindy v Midstate Medical Center 1130445
Stevens, Lorraine v. Urban League 0010328
Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection 0910275

National Origin Discrimination

Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno 0940298
Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505 (appeal dismissed)
Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash 0330082
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 9910114

Notice of claim

Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge (03/03/09) 0640147

Obesity

Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163

Pattern of Discrimination

Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (motion to dismiss) 0520402
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to dismiss)

Pension Plan

Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield 9420437
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650
(appeal withdrawn)

Perceived Disability--§ 46a-60(a)(1)

Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577

Piercing the Corporate Veil

Abildgaard, William v. New Horizons Computer Learning 0110495
Center
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores (2 decisions) 9510617
L'Annunziata, Paul v. New Horizons Learning Center 0210153
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge
(motion to amend complaint) (12/29/08) 0640147

Post-judgment Interest

Slootskin, Inessa v. John Brown Engineers & 9320176
Construction, Inc.

Preemption--§ 301 Labor-Management Relations Act

Bernd, Robert (9710052)*; Bielanski, John* (9710053) *& Perry, Richard* (9710063) *v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.*
Joiner, David v. H.E.R.E. Local 217 0410177
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577

Pregnancy discrimination

Senra, Susan v Groton Open MRI LLC 1140018
Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031

Prejudgment Interest

Agvent, Rosa Maria v. Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Comp. 0020042
Engin. Tech.
Brelig, Diana Lee v. F&L Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse 9540683
Restaurant
Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck 8330054
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury 9530587
(appeal withdrawn)
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650
(appeal withdrawn)

Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc. 9920353
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)
Slootskin, Inessa v. John Brown Engineers & Construction, Inc. 9320176
Williams, Robert v. M.N.S. Corporation 0010124

Pretext

Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9530477
Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash 0330082
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650
Leftridge, Rachael v. Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield 9830218
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services 9940089
(appeal withdrawn)
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)

Prima Facie Case

Alexsavich, Bruce & Ronald Ferguson v. Pratt & Whitney Aircraft 9330373, 9330374
Artis, Carnell v Kelly Services, C. Kostas and Covidien LP dba Covidien 1230079 (1230080, 1230184)
Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505
(appeal dismissed)
Blake, Lugenia v. Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut 9530630
Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co. 9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Clark, Jeffrey v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9830599
(appeal dismissed)
Clements, Joyce v. Town of Brookfield 9620571

Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept. 9710685, 9710637 (remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Dako-Smith, Frederica v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services 0020228, 0220142 (appeal dismissed)
Danner, Stephanie v ATOS IT Solutions and Services, Inc. 1730314 (on appeal, remanded)
Duarte, James v. Hamilton Standard 9610553
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9530477
Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash 0330082
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corp. 9710649, 9710650 (appeal withdrawn)
Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health 9710032 (appeal dismissed)
Hudson, Betsy v New London Public Schools 0840264
Intagliata, Debra J. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9740381
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
Kinder, Anthony v. Department of Children and Families 0730367
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482 (appeal dismissed)
Leftridge, Rachael v. Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield 9830218
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Maier, Martin H. v. City of Norwalk 9320024
Maier, Martin H. v. Norwalk Municipal Employees Assoc. 9320026
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Mayo, Alfred Parker v Bauer, Inc. 0831066

Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 9910114
Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services 9940089 (appeal withdrawn)
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124 (appeal dismissed)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041 (appeal dismissed)
Staszewski, Mark v Town of Wallingford 1030290

Pro se party

Aguiar, Deborah v. Nancy and Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)
Negron, Lishka v. DSMA Enterprises 0110448
Standard, Tracy A. v. Esposito Design Associates, Inc. 0820445
(objection to defendant corporation proceeding pro se)

Promotion

Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford 9710685, 9710637
Fire Dept. (remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education. 0420409
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health 9710032
(appeal dismissed)
Leftridge, Rachael v. Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield 9830218
Mather, Jayantha v Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Melvin, Roderick v. Yale University 0230320
O'Halloran, Josephine v. Town of Fairfield 0620146
(appeal dismissed)
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124
(appeal dismissed)

Protected activity

Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge (03/03/09) 0640147

Public Accommodation

Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven 9830205
Bd. of Ed. (on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. 9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)
Couture, Alan v. Waterbury Republican 0630390
(motion to dismiss) (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Lorimer, Valerie v Southern CT State Univ 1230447
McDonald, Robert v. Waterbury Republican 0630389
(motion to dismiss) (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Miranda, Andrew v New Haven Bd of Educ 1030148
Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the
Univ of Connecticut Health Center (motion to strike) 1330398
Toepelt, Rochelle v. Nailtique aks Nailtique, Inc. 0720118
Vargas, Alsenet v Dept of Correction 1110437
Young, Claude v. City of Stamford Police Dept. 0720418
(motion to dismiss, 11/18/09)

Public estoppel

Aguiar, Deborah v. Nancy and Ralph Frenzilli 9850105
(on remand, withdrawn)

Race and/or Color Discrimination

Carver, Monica v. Drawbridge Inn Restaurant 9940179
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski 9710196, 9710197
Dexter, Frank v. Dept. of Correction 0320165
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
Kinder, Anthony v. Department of Children and Families 0730367
Latef, Roberts v Judicial Department, State of Connecticut 1030184
Leftridge, Rachael v. Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield 9830218
Mejias, David v. Mortgage Company of America 0639976
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 9910114
Rhodes, Kevin v. Mortgage Company of America 0630040
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education 9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions 0130212

Reasonable Accommodations

Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227
Cosme, Edgardo v. Sunrise Estates, LLC 0510210
Charette, Lisa v. Dept. of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
Danner, Stephanie v ATOS IT Solutions and Services, Inc. 1730314
(on appeal, remanded)
Duarte, James v. Hamilton Standard 9610553
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital 9530477
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (motion to dismiss) 0520402
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (final decision) 0520402
(on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Planas, Felix v Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis 1210127

Turner, Tammy v Dept. of Developmental Services 1010190
Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services 9940089
(appeal withdrawn)
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority 9710713

Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

Reasonable Cause Findings

Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
(motion to amend) 0430307
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
(the respondent's motion to compel) 0430307
Bernd, Robert (9710052); *Bielanski, John* (9710053) *& Perry, Richard* (9710063) *v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.*
Caruso, Jr., John v. Western Connecticut State University (motion to dismiss, 3/18/09) 0620214
Charette, Lisa v. Dept. of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
DiMicco, Rose v Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
Okonkwo, Francis v. Bidwell Healthcare Center 9940144
Parker-Bair, Florence v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles 0510486
(motion to dismiss, 12/15/09)
Perry, Claude v. Town of Ansonia 9730481
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority 9710713
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge (03/03/09) 0640147

Recusal

Sarnecky, Fred v. Hamilton Standard 9910156

Reduction in Force

Alexsavich, Bruce & Ronald Ferguson v. Pratt & Whitney Aircraft 9330373, 9330374
Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2021) 0840032
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. 0920414
Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2018) 0840162
Flood, Robert v. American Can Company 8220420
Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley 0840243
Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies 0510366
Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031
Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley 0840008

Regarded as Disabled—ADA

Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc. 9830459
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577

Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies
Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center (§ 46a-54-38a(a), motion to dismiss, 7/22/08) 0610446
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Matson, Joel v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addictions Services 9930311

Rehabilitation Act
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Miranda, Andrew v New Haven Bd of Educ 1030148

Reinstatement
Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals 0330171 (appeal withdrawn)
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273 (appeal withdrawn)
Lopes, Elizabeth v. Comfort Suites 0540252
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Planas, Felix v Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis 1210127
Slootskin, Inessa v. John Brown Engineers & Construction, Inc. 9320176

"Relate back" doctrine
Caruso, Jr., John v. Western Connecticut State University (motion to dismiss, 3/18/09) 0620214

Release of claim
Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley 0840243

Release of Jurisdiction
Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut (2 separate decisions) 9730257
Taylor, Thaddeus v Salvation ARC 1010252
Walley, Terry v. Dept. of Correction 0020470

Religious Discrimination
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services (motion to dismiss) 0220394

Remand
Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. 0210354
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski 9710196, 9710197
Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck 8330054

Rent differential

Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250114

Residential Real-Estate-Related Transactions

Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co. 9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069

Res Judicata

Blinkoff Holly v. City of Torrington 9530406 (remanded by Court of Appeals)
Blake, Lugenia v. Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut 9530630
Carey, Edward J. v. Imagineers, LLC 9850104
Caruso, Jr., John v. Western Connecticut State University (motion to dismiss, 3/18/09) 0620214
Duncan, Clive v CT Trane 0410319
Perreira, Bhagmattie v Yale New Haven Hospital 1430048
Rajtar, Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield (motion to dismiss) 0510115
Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7 0130607

Retaliation

Blinkoff, Holly v City of Torrington (07/17/07) 9530406
Blinkoff Holly v. City of Torrington (final decision, 08/25/08) 9530406
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson (final decision) 0750001, 0750002
Carver, Monica v. Drawbridge Inn Restaurant 9940179
Carretero, Stefan v. Hartford Public Schools. 0310481
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept. 9710685, 9710637 (remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno 0940298
Dako-Smith, Frederica v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services 0020228 & 0220142 (appeal dismissed)
Demmerle, Mark v New England Stair Co. 1730020
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. 0920414
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Franuenhofer, Ann v Ascent Service & Technologies, LLC 1010090
Hartling, Judy v. Carfi, Jeffrey 0550116
Intagliata, Debra J. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9740381
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Lopes, Elizabeth v. Comfort Suites 0540252
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039 (appeal dismissed)
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116 (rev'd on appeal)
Melvin, Roderick v. Yale University 0230320

Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co. 0120389
Peterson*, Dana v. City of Hartford, Police Dept.* 0410049
Planas, Felix v Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis 1210127
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge (03/03/09) 0640147
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163 (on appeal, remanded by stipulation)
Schopick, Andrew v. Nutmeg Securities, et al. 1123092, 1120439, 1120440
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority 9710713
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041 (appeal dismissed)

Reverse Discrimination

Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co. 9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept. 9710685, 9710637 (remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)

Safety Defense

Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction 9740163
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (final decision) 0520402 (on appeal, stipulated judgment)

Same actor

Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc. 1110081

Sanctions (see also motion for sanctions)

Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge Building 0640147 (motion for sanctions, 7/1/09)
Tavares, Cori v. Sam's Club, Wal-Mart Stores Inc. 9730092 (vacated on appeal by stipulated judgment)

Schools

Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven Bd. of Ed. 9830205 (on appeal stipulated judgment)
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. 9830294 (rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)

Section 8 Housing Assistance

Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Daniels, Jeffrey v Andre Ruellan 0550012
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250114
Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard 0550113
Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba 0450057

Thompson, Nicole v Marc & Marie Pennino and John & Karen Bauco 0450008 (appeal withdrawn)

Sex Stereotyping

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

Sexual Harassment

Charette, Lisa v. Dept. of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc. 0420438
Doe, Jane v. Claywell Electric 0510199
Lopes, Elizabeth v. Comfort Suites 0540252
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd. 9820039 (appeal dismissed)
Milton, Michele v. Pulte Homes, Inc., 0630188 (appeal withdrawn)
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance 9640243

Sexual Orientation (actual and perceived)

Couture, Alan v. Waterbury Republican (motion to dismiss) 0630390 (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323
Hartling, Judy v. Jeffrey Carfi 0550116
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482 (appeal dismissed)
McDonald, Robert v. Waterbury Republican 0630389 (motion to dismiss) (on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163 (on appeal, remanded by stipulation)

Similarly Situated

Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc. 0430505 (appeal dismissed)
Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2021) 0840032
Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno 0940298
Dexter, Frank v. Dept. of Correction 0320165
Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2018) 0840162
Intagliata, Debra J. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9740381
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482 (appeal dismissed)
Latef, Roberts v Judicial Department, State of Connecticut 1030184
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 9910114
Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley 0840243
Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031
Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley 0840008

Social Security Disability Claim, Effect on Disability Discrimination Complaint

Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc. 8840227

Sovereign immunity

Planas, Felix v Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis 1210127

Robinson, Patricia v. Dept. of Mental Health 0630292
(motion to dismiss)

Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 0710348
(motion to dismiss, 05/19/09)

Standing

McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080

McWeeny, Robert v. City of Hartford 0410314
(appeal dismissed)

Statistics

Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2021) 0840032

DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp. 0920414

Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2018) 0840162

Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley 0840243

Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031

Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley 0840008

Statute of Limitations

Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield 9420437

Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center (motion to dismiss, 7/22/08) 0610446

D'Angelo, Edward v. University of Bridgeport 9520184, 9520185, 9520186

Feroleto, Salvatore v. Dept. of Mental Retardation 0510140

Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)

Gallant, Michelle, v. Torrad Assoc. LLC 1830431
(motion to dismiss, 02/18/2022)

Kelly, Brian v. City of New Britain 0210359

Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (motion to dismiss) 0520402

Magda, Muriel v. Diageo North America 0420213

Perri, Dennis v George Peluso (motion to dismiss) 0750113

Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

Statutory Interpretation

Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden 9730288

Storage costs

Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250115
Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus 0250114

Stray remark

Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2021) 0840032
Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley (04/18/2018) 0840162
Schopick, Andrew v. Nutmeg Securities, et al. 1123092, 1120439, 1120440
Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley 0840243
Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley (12/13/2012) 0840031
Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc. 1110081
Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley 0840008

Subpoena

Benjamin, Uel v. Mediplex of Greater Hartford 9910193
Czuchra, Roger A. v. Pace Motor Lines (10/22/10) 0820039

Successor Liability

Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores (2 decisions) 9510617

Testing accommodation

Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford (final decision) 0520402
(on appeal, stipulated judgment)

Title VII

Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept. 9710685, 9710637
(remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington 9730281, 9730280,
(final decision 1/26/00; Supplemental 7/13/01) 9730279, 9730278
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford 0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services 0020220
Intagliata, Debra J. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 9740381
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Leftridge, Rachael v. Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield 9830218
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation 9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection 9910114
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)

Title VIII

Andrees, JoAnn Andrees v. Raymond & Sylvia Rinaldi 0650116
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson 075001, 075002
(final decision)

Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority 0050061
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark 9810387
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to dismiss)
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(final decision)
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

Trade name
Ferri, Susan v Darien Barber Shop 0520471
(motion to dismiss, 4/15/08)

Transfer (Inter-agency)
Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven Bd. of Ed. 9830205
(on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed. (5/31/00) 9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)

Transfer (Intra-agency)
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education. 0420409
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain 9810482
(appeal dismissed)

Transsexual/transgender
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University 0130315, 0230323

Undue Hardship
Charette, Lisa v. Dept. of Social Services 9810371, 9810581
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)

Wheelchair
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk 9720041
(appeal dismissed)

Witnesses
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v Donna & David Vahlstrom 0750080
(motion to reopen public hearing)

Workshare Agreement
Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center (motion to dismiss, 7/22/08) 0610446
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University 0140203
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp. 9610577

Wrongful Termination

Navarro, Edwin v. Hospital for Special Care 9710678

Zoning

Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc. 0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

II. Decisions/rulings listed alphabetically by complainant

Abildgaard, William v. New Horizons Computer Learning Center
0110495
FitzGerald, 08/07/03

The commission's motion to amend complaint granted. Complaint may be amended to correct an address, change a date and to add the respondent's parent corporation as a respondent.

Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli
9850105
Wilkerson, 1/14/00

Hearing in damages. The complainants attempted to rent a home from the respondents and the respondents would not allow the complainants to rent because they had small children. Discrimination based on family status. Award for emotional distress damages of $7,500 to the complainant wife and $3,500 to the complainant husband both with 10% post-judgment interest. Also awarded Attorney's fees of $8,236.25.

Aguiar, Deborah. v. Nancy & Ralph Frenzilli
9850105
(on remand)
FitzGerald, 4/22/02

Motion to set aside default denied with a hearing in damages to be scheduled. Following the entry of a default and a hearing in damages, the commission and complainant brought an enforcement action in Superior Court. The case was remanded with instructions to hold a hearing on setting aside the default and a hearing in damages. The respondents lacked both a good defense and/or reasonable cause for failure to timely raise their defense.

Agvent, Rosa Maria v. Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Computer Engin. Technology
0020042
Trojanowski, 4/11/01

Hearing in damages. Female computer worker awarded backpay, compound prejudgment interest, statutory postjudgment interest, and other equitable relief.

Alexsavich, Bruce & Ronald Ferguson v. Pratt & Whitney Aircraft
9330373, 9330374
Manzione, 10/4/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* The complainants proved a prima facie case because they were members of a protected class under the ADEA (over age 40), qualified for the position, demoted under circumstances giving rise to an inference of age discrimination. They failed, however, to meet their ultimate burden of proving age

discrimination because they did not prove that the respondent's legitimate, non-discriminatory reason of selection for the reduction in force (RIF) based on performance was pretextual.

Ali, Liaquiat v Bridgeport, City of,
0750131, 0750132
Wilkerson, 11/14/07

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondents (City of Bridgeport and Bridgeport planning and zoning commission) moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction as to the city arguing that the city had no authority to amend or enforce the zoning regulations. CHRO argued that the complaint against alleged discrimination in housing and was not an appeal of a zoning regulation. Held*:* the city shall remain a respondent because it is inferred that the planning and zoning commission is an authorized decision-maker for the city and acted as a policy maker for the city when it enforced the zoning regulations.

Allen, Sheila v. Pollack's
9710692
Manzione, 6/17/99

Motion to dismiss granted. At a public hearing, the human rights referee granted a motion to dismiss from the respondent's counsel (with the support of the commission) based on the complainant's failure to cooperate. (The complainant was pro se and failed to respond to numerous communications from the commission counsel and the office of public hearings).

Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven Bd. of Ed.
9830205
(on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Manzione, 5/3/00

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) public schools are not public accommodations under General Statutes § 46a-64(a); (2) the commission does not have jurisdiction over allegations of discrimination brought pursuant to General Statutes § 10-15c; and (3) General Statutes §§ 46a-75 and 46a-81m do not cover public schools.

Amos, Barry E. v. Town of West Hartford
9910041, 9910198, 9910199, 9910200, 9910201, 9910202
Manzione, 6/5/00

Motion for stay denied. Held*:* A matter scheduled for public hearing in six weeks will not be stayed pending the outcome of a possible declaratory judgment by a judicial authority because (1) the commission is charged with addressing complaints of discrimination; (2) the commission declined to address this matter through a declaratory ruling and rather set the matter down for these "specified proceedings;" (3) the matter is ripe for adjudication because most of the pre-hearing matters have already occurred; and (4) proceeding with the public

hearing, rather than staying it, will resolve the "real and substantial dispute between the parties."

Andrees, JoAnn v. Raymond & Sylvia Rinaldi
0650116
FitzGerald, 12/10/08 :

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. The complainant alleged that the respondents discriminated against her in violation of 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1982 and Title VIII and also General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64c (a) (1) and (2) when they refused to rent a condominium unit to her because of her race and color. Held: The commission and the complainant cannot establish their prima facie case and/or cannot establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents intentionally discriminated against the complainant because of her race and color because they failed to provide credible persuasive evidence that the respondents knew the complainant was black.

Artis, Carnell v Kelly Services, C. Kostas and Covidien LP dba Covidien
1230079, 1230080, 1230184
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Motion for directed verdict following the presentation of the complainant's case granted. The complainant filed three complainants alleging race and age discrimination, retaliation, and aiding and abetting. Following one day of trial, the respondent moved for a directed verdict on the grounds that the complainant submitted no evidence of discriminatory animus. *Held*: motion granted pursuant to Regulation 46a-54-78a (4) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Azam, Qazi v. Yale University
0430623
FitzGerald, 10/16/2006

The commission's motion to compel granted in part. Inter alia, the respondent, pursuant to General Statutes § 31-128f (2), was ordered to produce documents submitted by the successful candidates for the job positions the complainant had applied for.

Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
0430307
FitzGerald, 11/18/05

Ruling on commission's motion to amend the complaint to add claims of retaliation and national origin discrimination Denied. The complaint alleged that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his age. The allegations of retaliation and national origin discrimination had not been alleged in the complaint, investigated by the commission during or raised by the complainant during the pre-certification factfinding investigation, or supported by any factual findings in the reasonable cause finding. The motion is denied because the requirement under § 46a-83, that the investigator list the factual findings on

whether there is reasonable cause to believe that retaliation and national origin discrimination occurred, is a condition precedent to a hearing on those allegations.

Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
0430307
FitzGerald, 01/23/06

The commission's motion to compel denied for failure to articulate an explanation of how the requested documents were relevant and material to the facts of the case.

Baker, Sandra v Hartford Public Schools
1310147
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Motion to dismiss. Motion granted in part and denied in part. *Held:* motion granted as to the Section 46a-58(a) claim seeking to enforce Title VII, the 46a-64(a) claim and the 46a-75 claim. Motion denied as to the 46a-58(a) claim seeking to enforce General Statute 10-15c.

Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
0430307
FitzGerald, 01/23/06

The respondent's motion to compel denied. The respondents requested documents to contest the commission's finding of reasonable cause. However, the public hearing is a hearing on the merits and not an appeal of the commission's pre-certification processing of the complaint. General Statutes § 46a-84 (b).

Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)
Giliberto, 7/15/99

Motion to dismiss granted in part. Held*:* (1) the commission does not have jurisdiction over claims pursuant to §10-15c; (2) public schools are not public accommodations; and (3) the commission does not have concurrent jurisdiction with the Dept of Education pursuant to §46a-58 and §46a-64(a)(2). On appeal, Superior Court vacated the referee's dismissal, found that the commission does have jurisdiction to hear complaints of discrimination against students in public schools, and remanded the case for further proceedings.

Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)
Giliberto, 5/31/00

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) General Statutes § 46a-75 does not apply to public schools; and (2) the commission through the human rights referee does not have the authority to transfer this matter to the State Board of Education. On appeal, Superior Court vacated the referee's dismissal, found that the commission does have jurisdiction to hear complaints of discrimination against students in public schools, and remanded the case for further proceedings.

Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294
FitzGerald, 11/15/05

Amended ruling re: the respondent's motion to vacate. The respondent requested reconsideration of an order granting the commission's motion to compel. The respondent claimed that producing the documents would violate the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The respondent's motion denied as the requested documents were within statutory exceptions.

Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294
FitzGerald, 12/12/05

The respondent's motion for sanctions and to dismiss the complaint granted in part, denied in part. The complainant failed to comply with order to produce documents responsive to the respondent's production request. Because the requested documents were not relevant to the parties' burden of proof as to whether a discriminatory act occurred, the complaint was not dismissed. Because the requested documents were relevant as to the impact of the alleged discriminatory act on the complainant as his claim for emotional damages, the complainant and the commission are prohibited from introducing any oral or documentary evidence that the complainant sought and/or received treatment for emotional distress as a result of the alleged discriminatory act and they are prohibited from introducing any oral or documentary evidence of the impact the alleged discriminatory act had on the complainant's subsequent educational and employment performance after he withdrew from Cheshire High School.

Banks, Shirley v. Eddie Eckhaus
0250115
Wilkerson, 5/23/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant who possessed a section 8 voucher attempted to rent a home from the respondent who refused to accept the voucher and would not allow the complainant to apply to rent the house. Discrimination based on lawful source of income and

public advertising. The complainant was awarded emotional distress damages of $4,500 and attorney fees.

Barnes, Arnell v. Alan S. Goodman, Inc.
0710395
Levine, 6/5/2009

Motion for summary judgment: denied. Held: (1) referees have the authority to rule on motions for summary judgment; and (2) issue of material issue of fact exists as evident by the complaint affidavit alleging discrimination based on color (black) and disparate treatment, production compliance resulting in some documentation of disparate treatment and the respondent's vigorous denial of discrimination.

Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc.
0430505
(appeal dismissed)
Wilkerson Brillant 07/16/08

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged discrimination in the terms and conditions of his employment on the basis of his race, color, alienage, national origin and ancestry (Arabic). Held: The commission and the complainant failed to prove under both the mixed motive and pretext analyses that the respondent discriminated against the complainant by treating him differently than non-basis similarly situated employees because of his ancestry and national origin (Arabic) when it suspended him for one day and warned him.

Benjamin, Uel v. Mediplex of Greater Hartford
9910193
Knishkowy, 9/8/00

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* Under certain circumstances, as in this case, a prior arbitration award adverse to the complainant does not bar the complainant from bringing a subsequent action with the commission and has no preclusive effect on the facts and issues raised therein.

Bentley-Meunier, LaToya v DEKK Group dba Dunkin Donuts
1140322
Mount, 04/11/2012

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $17,619.90 in backpay; $7,500 in emotional distress damages and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Bernd, Robert v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.
9710052
FitzGerald, 01/04/02

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) whether the complainant applied for a position is a question of fact; (2) the public hearing is not an opportunity to challenge the adequacy of precertification investigation; (3) commission has jurisdiction to adjudicate ADEA claims; (4) failure of investigator to comply with "date certain" for issuance of reasonable cause finding pursuant to General Statutes § 46a-82 does not result in the dismissal of the complaint; (5) complaint is not necessarily preempted by Labor Management Act.

Bielanski, John v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.
9710053
FitzGerald, 01/04/02

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1)whether the complainant applied for a position is a question of fact; (2) the public hearing is not an opportunity to challenge the adequacy of precertification investigation; (3) commission has jurisdiction to adjudicate ADEA claims; (4) failure of investigator to comply with "date certain" for issuance of reasonable cause finding pursuant to General Statutes § 46a-82 does not result in the dismissal of the complaint; (5) complaint is not necessarily preempted by Labor Management Act.

Blake, Lugenia v. Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut
9530630
Allen, 7/8/99

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) Human Rights Referees have authority to dismiss matters; (2) Prior administrative decision by a separate state agency is given res judicata effect; (3) the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case for employment discrimination.

Blinkoff, Holly v. City of Torrington
9530406
(remanded by Court of Appeals)
FitzGerald, 05/10/04

The respondent's motion for summary judgment granted and the case dismissed. The complainant filed her complaint with the commission in 1995. In 1997, the commission's motion for stay was granted because the complainant had filed an action in federal court in which she raised the same state discrimination claims appearing in her CHRO complaint. In the federal action, the complainant's state claims were dismissed because she failed to obtain a release from the commission. Held: The complainant had an adequate opportunity to have her state claims adjudicated in federal court. The federal dismissal of her state discrimination claims was due to her own voluntary decision either not to proceed with those claims in federal court and/or not to seek a release from the commission.

Blinkoff Holly v. City of Torrington
9530406
FitzGerald, 06/28/04

On June 7, 2004, the commission filed a motion for articulation of the May 10, 2004 order dismissing the complaint. Ruling: the order of dismissal adequately articulated the basis for the dismissal.

Blinkoff, Holly v City of Torrington
9530406
FitzGerald, 07/17/07

The respondent's motion to dismiss denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent retaliated against her for filing a complaint with the commission. The respondent moved to dismiss arguing that no employment relationship existed between the complainant and the respondent. Held: under § 46a-60 (a) (4), a claim for retaliation can arise either from an employment relationship or from the filing of a complaint with the commission.

Blinkoff, Holly v City of Torrington
9530406
FitzGerald, 08/25/08

Final decision. The commission and the complainant established by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents retaliated against the complainant (1) in 1995 when they filed a lawsuit against her seeking injunctive relief and (2) when they scheduled her special exceptions permit application in January 1997 rather than December 1996. Nevertheless, no monetary damages are awarded as the commission and the complainant failed to establish that these retaliatory actions resulted in monetary damages to the complainant.

Braffith, Samuel v. Peter Pan Bus Lines
0540183
Wilkerson Brillant, 11/13/09

The respondent's motion in limine denied. The respondent moved to exclude evidence regarding the complainant's emotional distress damages because it posited that the commission does not have the authority to award emotional distress damages in employment discrimination cases where § 46a-60 is alleged. This tribunal awards emotional distress damages based on the premise that when a respondent has violated a federal law, e.g., Title VII, covered under § 46a-58 (a); then remedies under § 46a-86 (c), which include emotional distress damages, are available.

Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc.
0210354
FitzGerald, 05/25/04

Motion to dismiss denied and the complaint remanded to the investigator to attempt conciliation. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss the complaint in its entirety because the investigator did not attempt conciliation prior to her certification of the complaint. The respondent claimed that § 46a-83(f) mandates that an investigator attempt conciliation, and that the investigator's failure in this case to attempt conciliation resulted in the commission losing subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint. Held: (1) an attempt to conciliate is mandatory under § 46a-83(f), (2) this statutory requirement to attempt conciliation is a condition precedent to certification and public hearing, not an issue of subject matter jurisdiction; and (3) because subject matter jurisdiction is not lost if the attempt at conciliation is held more than 50 days after a finding of reasonable cause [see § 46a-82e(a)], the complaint is remanded to the investigator to attempt conciliation, and, if conciliation is unsuccessful, to then certify the complaint for public hearing. As the complaint is being remanded, the respondent's arguments to dismiss portions of the complaint as untimely need not be addressed at this time.

Brelig, Diana Lee v. F&L Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse Restaurant
9540683
Wilkerson, 2/2/00

Hearing in damages. Former waitress awarded: (1) Back pay in the amount of $37,616.08; and (2) Prejudgment interest in the amount of $3,419.64.

Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co.
9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Giliberto, 11/16/99

Motion to dismiss granted in part. Held: (1) Motion to dismiss is treated as a motion to strike; (2) § 46a-64c(a)(2) protects against discriminatory practices after the initial sale or rental transaction; (3) § 46a-64c(a)(3) does not apply solely to discrimination in advertising and includes verbal statements; (4) family members of disabled individuals are protected from discriminatory practices pursuant to § 46a-64c(a)(6)(B) and (C); (5) the discriminatory acts alleged against the respondent management company and the respondent property manager do not constitute "residential real-estate-related transactions" pursuant to § 46a-64(a)(7); and (6) white persons are protected from racial discrimination under the state and federal fair housing laws.

Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co.
9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Giliberto, 3/13/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held*:* All of the parties failed to appear for the public hearing, therefore the complainants and the commission failed to establish a prima facie case.

Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson
0750001, 0750002
Knishkowy, 07/03/07

Ruling on request for production. Held: Notwithstanding the caption of this document, the respondent's pleading is, de facto, a set of interrogatories. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the commission regulations to requests for production. Absent express authorization, interrogatories are impermissible.

Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson
0750001, 0750002
Knishkowy, 11/17/08

Final decision. Judgment for the complainants. Complainants husband and wife rented apartment from the respondent landlord. When husband lost his job after several months, he applied for rental subsidy. The respondent landlord refused to complete the requisite forms and husband ultimately could not complete his application to obtain the subsidy. The respondent offered myriad reasons for her refusal, many inherently inconsistent or simply not credible. Held: given liberal reading of fair housing statutes, and following logic of other cases, thwarting the complainant's ability to obtain subsidy is not meaningfully different than outright refusing to accept lawful subsidy. The landlord violated §46a-64c(a)(2). After refusing to help husband, the landlord engaged in a two-month period of severe harassment of both complainants. Held: landlord's egregious, severe and pervasive actions and provocations were in retaliation for husband's attempt to obtain subsidy, and they created a hostile housing environment, violating both §§ 46a-64c(a)(2) and 46a-64c(a)(9).

Brown, Kim v. Olsten Services, Inc.
9920046
(appeal dismissed 11/10/99; following appeal, stipulated judgment)
Giliberto, 2/19/99

Motion to open default granted. Held*:* (1) the human rights referee has authority at default hearing to open default entered by acting executive director and (2) matter referred back to investigative office.

Browne, Philip v Dept of Correction
1130416
Wilson, 11/26/2013 (corrected ruling)

Motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action. Motion denied. *Held*: when construed broadly and in a manner most favorable to the complainant, the fact alleged and necessarily implied are sufficient to state a claim.

Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley
0840032
Mount, 04/18/2021

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Caggiano, Caterina v. Doreen Rockhead
0450017
Trojanowski, 05/05/04

Hearing in damages. Housing case. The complainant was awarded $210 in compensatory damages for medical care, $150 for attorney's fees, $4,500 for emotional distress damages and post judgment interest of 10% per annum.

Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield
9420437
FitzGerald, 10/15/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of age in denying him participation in its pension plan.

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

The respondent's "motion to preclude relitigation of factual findings in *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* and to preclude relitigation of certain legal issues as a result of the *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* decision" is denied. The respondent argued that the doctrine of collateral estoppel should apply so as to preclude the relitigation of the factual and legal findings determined in connection with the final decision issued in *O'Halloran*. Collateral estoppel is inapplicable for at least three reasons. First, the presiding referee concluded that O'Halloran did not prove discrimination; he did not conclude that the respondent did not discriminate. Second, in *O'Halloran*, the presiding referee specifically noted that: he did not intend his findings in

O'Halloran to be applied to the merits of this case. Finally, under the facts of this case, the policies underlying collateral estoppel and the anti-discrimination statutes favor not applying collateral estoppel.

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine is granted to preclude evidence of qualifications unknown to the decision-maker at the time of the hiring decision. Under the "after-acquired evidence" doctrine, information that was unknown to the decision-maker at the time he made his decision could not have influenced his decision and, therefore, is irrelevant as to his motivation in choosing whom to hire.

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine seeking to preclude the introduction of evidence regarding any emotional distress damages is denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it refused to hire her for the position of zoning inspector because of her sex. Although emotional distress damages are not available for a violation of § 46a-60, the complainant's damage claims also arise from the respondent's alleged unlawful practices under Title VII, which would constitute a violation of § 46a-58 (a) and afford the complainant the relief, including emotional distress damages, available under General Statute § 46a-86 (c).

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142
FitzGerald, 07/10/09

Motion for reconsideration of the ruling sustaining the respondent's in limine objection to the testimony of Josephine O'Halloran is denied. First, as proffered by the commission, O'Halloran's proposed testimony offered no obvious or logical connection to the issue of the respondent's alleged discriminatory conduct toward the complainant. Second, O'Halloran is not a "similarly situated" witness. Third, the commission provided no specific as to the discriminatory treatment of the complainant that O'Halloran personally observed and also provided no specific information as to what testimony O'Halloran could corroborate that would both need corroboration and also not be unduly repetitious.

Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142
FitzGerald, 12/28/09

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant was one of four applicants (three females and one male) for the position of zoning inspector. The respondent hired the male applicant for the position. The complainant alleged that she was not hired because of her sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of her sex when it did not hire her for the position of zoning inspector.

Carretero, Stefan v. Hartford Public Schools
0310481
Knishkowy, 11/28/05

Two-part motion for "summary disposition" denied. The complainant filed his initial complaint alleging that the non-renewal of his teaching contract was motivated by discrimination; in his amended complaint, he claimed that the respondent's refusal to replace the termination notice in his personnel file with a resignation letter was in retaliation for his initial complaint. Held*:* (1) The respondent's claim that complainant failed to exhaust administrative remedies raises a jurisdictional issue and thus is treated as motion to dismiss. The exhaustion doctrine applies when a party brings a complaint to the superior court without exhausting administrative remedies. In this case, the doctrine is not applicable; there is no legal justification, explicit or otherwise, or convincing policy argument for a complainant to exhaust remedies under Teacher Tenure Act (§10-151) before bringing a discriminatory termination claim to the CHRO. (2) The respondent also argues that the complainant has not demonstrated that he suffered an adverse employment action, and that allowing the complainant to substitute a resignation letter at this time would compromise the respondent's ability to defend against the initial claim. Whether the complainant suffered an adverse employment action is an issue of material fact whose resolution is premature without further evidence. While the legal defense argument has been recognized as valid by various court decisions, in this case further evidence is needed before this tribunal can rule conclusively, especially in light of allegation that the respondent stated that its refusal to change the personnel file was due to the filing of the initial complaint.

Carey, Edward J. v. Imagineers, LLC
9850104
Wilkerson, 9/2/99

Motion to stay denied. The commission moved for stay of the proceedings because complainant had filed an action in federal court. The complainant joined and the respondent did not object. Held*:* Res judicata and collateral estoppel are not valid reasons to grant a stay of proceedings, no duplication of efforts, no unnecessary costs, and discovery by the commission may be used to effect discovery in the federal action. No plausible reason existed to grant stay of proceedings.

Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc.
8840227
FitzGerald, 2/28/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) termination of employment due to physical disability (cancer). The complainant proved discrimination by both the direct and inferential evidence standards. The respondent failed to show a bona fide occupational qualification and the complainant showed that the respondent's claims of essential job function were not worthy of credence; and (2) the complainant proved that the respondent aided and abetted in his termination.

Caruso, Jr., John v. Western Connecticut State University
0620214
FitzGerald, 3/18/09

Motion to dismiss granted in part. The complainant is employed by the respondent as a professor. On November 3, 2005, he filed an affidavit with the commission alleging that because of his participation on behalf of his wife's discrimination claim against the respondent, the respondent thereafter retaliated against him. The complainant identified three retaliatory acts, one of which occurred in 2004. (The 2004 retaliatory act was also included in a prior affidavit the complainant had filed with the commission in 2004. The commission dismissed the 2004 affidavit after finding no reasonable cause). Following an unsuccessful conciliation conference on December 12, 2008, the complainant filed an amended affidavit that included as a fourth alleged retaliatory act a failure to hire claim that arose in 2005. Held: the 2004 allegation was dismissed as untimely filed and as precluded by the res judicata effect of the commission's dismissal of the 2004 complaint. The 2005 failure to hire claim was not saved by the "relate back" doctrine and was dismissed as untimely.

Carver, Monica v. Drawbridge Inn Restaurant
9940179
Allen, 6/12/02

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleges discrimination in the terms and conditions of her employment on the basis of her alienage (American Indian), and that she was discharged in retaliation for her complaints regarding alleged sexual harassment in the workplace. Held: The complainant failed to establish prima facie case as to her claim regarding discriminatory treatment in the terms and conditions of her employment. The complainant also failed to establish a prima facie case that she was fired in retaliation for her complaints because evidence showed, inter alia, that she quit her job.

Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors
0030569, 0030586, 0030587
Knishkowy, 2/15/02

Motion to disqualify opposing counsel denied. Held: The law firm of a lawyer who represented the complainant many years ago now represents the respondents in the present action. The complainant moved to disqualify the firm and its members under Rule 1.9 and 1.10 of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Because the earlier representation bears no "substantial relationship"—in fact, no relationship at all—to the present matter, no violation of the Rules exists.

Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors
0030569, 0030586, 0030587
Knishkowy, 3/21/02

Motion to strike special defenses granted. The respondent raised two special defenses predicated upon prior findings and determination of the commission investigator as to some of the allegations in the complaint. However, the complaint was certified to hearing in its entirety, and thus, the referee must conduct a de novo hearing on the entire complaint; the respondent cannot successfully base special defenses solely on the investigator's report.

Charette, Lisa v. Dept. of Social Services
9810371, 9810581
FitzGerald, 4/26/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. The complainant alleged harassment based on disability, retaliation, sexual harassment, and failure to provide reasonable accommodation for her disability. Held*:* (1) Upon motion to dismiss by the respondents for lack of jurisdiction, the allegations for which no reasonable cause was found (harassment based on disability and retaliation) were dismissed at the commencement of the public hearing. (2) The sexual harassment allegation was dismissed. Evidence alleging the conduct occurred was not credible. Alternatively, the conduct, even if it occurred, did not rise to the level of actionable harassment. Also, the complainant unreasonably failed to utilize the employer's complaint procedure and to cooperate in the employer's investigation. (3) The allegation of failure to provide reasonable accommodation was dismissed. Reasonable accommodation is required under state antidiscrimination law. The complainant rejected the respondents' offer of a reasonable accommodation relative to the complainant's arrive time to work. The complainant failed to participate in the requisite good faith interactive process to determine the necessity of the requested private office, job restructuring, and special light bulbs.

Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc.
9830459
Knishkowy, 10/3/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant was terminated from employment when he showed up for work with Bell's palsy. The respondent claimed it terminated the complainant for poor work quality and had been planning to do so for some time. Although the complainant failed to prove that he was disabled under the ADA or FEPA, he did prove that the respondent regarded him as disabled under FEPA. The complainant established a strong prima facie case and proved that, under the circumstances of the case, the respondent's proffered reason was unworthy of credence.

Clark, Jeffrey v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.
9830599
(appeal dismissed)
Wilkerson, 1/25/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant filed a complaint claiming that he was demoted based on his disability. Held*:* The complainant did not establish a prima facie case under *McDonnell Douglas* proving that he was qualified by showing that he could perform the essential functions of his job with or without reasonable accommodations. The complainant also did not establish a prima facie case under *Price Waterhouse* analysis in that he did not prove that there was direct evidence of discrimination or rebut the respondent's reason for demoting the complainant.

Clements, Joyce v. Town of Brookfield
9620571
Allen, 7/6/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant brought an action claiming harassment and demotion based on her age and amended her complaint to assert wrongful discharge based on age and gender. Held*:* (1) The complainant's amended complaint was filed more than 180 days after the alleged act of discrimination; (2) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case; (3) The respondent's articulated non-discriminatory reason was valid and not pre-textual; (4) The complainant failed to produce evidence inferring that the abolition of her position in the Town's budget was motivated by her age or gender; (5) there was no evidence of the complainant being harassed or demoted.

Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno
1040407
Mount, 01/29/2014

Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that he was subjected to harassment, and unequal treatment due to his national origin and ancestry. He later amended his complaint to include a claim of that he was terminated in retaliation for his filing

of the complaint. *Held*: the complainant proved that the respondent discriminated against him. He was awarded backpay of $70,988.35; prejudgment interest of $31,944.75; attorney fees of $24,580; emotional distress damages of $5000 and post-judgment interest.

Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center
0610446
Wilkerson Brillant, 07/22/08

Motion to dismiss granted in part; denied in part. Held: (1) Because the complaint was amended as a matter of right prior to the appointment of the undersigned presiding referee pursuant to § 46a-54-38a (a) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the state law claims are not time-barred; 2) the complainant's basis for her § 46a-58 (a) claim is not a cause of action under § 46a-60 but is a cause of action under the federal ADA and, thus, the complainant's federal ADA claim has been converted to a claim under state law by way of § 46a-58 (a) and is a valid claim; 3) § 46a-70 applies to employment discrimination in state agencies and the respondent's alleged failure to provide a reasonable accommodation in order for the complainant to resume working is covered within § 46a-70; and 4) Section 46a-77 applies to services provided to the public by state agencies and does not apply to employment discrimination claims, therefore, the complainant does not state a valid claim under § 46a-77 and her claims pursuant to § 46a-77 are dismissed.

Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept.
9710685, 9710637
(remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Trojanowski, 8/14/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainants did not establish a prima facie case proving that the failure of the respondent to promote them was based on intentional discrimination due to their race and gender. The complainants also failed to establish a prima facie case proving that the respondent retaliated against them for the exercise of their rights under Title VII and CFEPA. After appeal, decision was remanded. On remand, judgment for the commission and complainant Donahue with relief as set forth in the decision.

Cooper, John & John C. Donahue. v. City of Hartford Fire Dept.
9710685, 9710637
Trojanowski, 9/7/00

Petition for reconsideration denied. The commission filed a petition for reconsideration citing the existence of a "valid settlement agreement" as its good cause. The respondent filed an objection based on the fact that although there was a proposed agreement between counsel, the agreement had not been approved by the Hartford City Council, the only authority authorized by the City Charter to approve settlements proposed by the Corporation Counsel. When the final decision was rendered, the City Council had not acted to finalize the agreement. Thus, the proposed settlement was invalidated because the decision came out before the Council had acted.

Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski
9710196, 9710197
Allen, 1/5/01

Remand decision. Judgment for the complainants. Held*:* The respondents discriminated against the complainants with respect to the terms and conditions of a prospective rental by requiring additional and more comprehensive credit, employment, and educational background information than was required of white tenants. The complainants are awarded $5,000.00 in damages for emotional distress.

Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski
9710196, 9710197
Allen, 1/31/01

Petition for reconsideration granted. The complainants and the commission are granted 30 days to file Motions seeking an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and the respondents shall have 10 days to file objections, if any.

Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski
9710196, 9710197
Allen, 4/16/01 (Supplemental)

The complainants awarded $20,000 in attorney's fees for the respondent's discrimination in regard to the terms and conditions associated with the rental of real estate; attorney's fees appropriate even where complainants represented by non-profit Legal Clinic; detailed time sheets sufficient to establish reasonableness of fees requested.

Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education.
0420409
Knishkowy, 7/21/04

Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part. Held: (1) The complainant's first allegation was based on a discrete event occurring more than 180 days prior to the filing of the complaint. Although in certain circumstances the 180-day filing requirement may be excused for equitable reasons, the commission, in its response to the motion, provided no suggestion--much less any evidence--of any such reason. The motion to dismiss this portion of the complaint is granted. (2) The respondent challenged the second allegation by claiming that failure to transfer or promote the complainant to a certain position did not constitute an adverse employment action. Such determination is a matter of fact and thus requires full adjudication. The motion to dismiss this portion of the complaint is denied.

Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education
0420409
Knishkowy, 9/21/04

Motion for leave to amend complaint. In an age discrimination case, the complainant moved to amend his complaint by adding legal conclusions of disability discrimination. Although the complainant argues that the additional charges clarify the factual allegations in the original complaint and "conform the legal grounds for the complaint with the factual allegations," such bald assertions are simply incorrect. Nothing in the original complaint so much as even alludes to any disability. The motion is denied. (Note: The respondent's failure to respond to the complainant's motion does not mandate automatic approval of the motion; rather, the presiding officer must still determine if the proposed amendment is "reasonable." See Regs. Conn. State Agencies, § 46a-54-80a(e).)

Correa, Jocelin v. La Casona Restaurant
0710004
Wilkerson, 04/28/08

Hearing in damages. Held: pursuant to the default order, the respondents were liable for discriminating against the complainant because of her pregnancy when they discharged her from employment. The complainant was awarded $19,404.88 for back pay, 10% pre-judgment interest of $1940.49, $2500 in emotional distress damages and post judgment interest of 10% per annum from the date of the final decision. The discriminatory act was not done in public and was not highly egregious; the emotional distress was not long in duration; and the consequences of the discrimination were not found to be directly linked to the discriminatory act. The respondent was ordered to cease and desist from discriminatory practices, not to retaliate against the complainant and to post the commission's antidiscrimination posters in its workplace.

Cosme, Edgardo v. Sunrise Estates, LLC
0510210
FitzGerald, 06/29/07

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: the respondent failed to reasonably accommodate the complainant's mental disability; discriminated against the complainant in the terms, conditions and privileges of his employment because of his mental disability; and terminated his employment because of his mental disability. The complainant awarded relief including $36,696 in back pay; $45,136 in front pay (four years); and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Couture, Alan v. Waterbury Republican
0630390
(on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 6/12/08

Motion to dismiss granted. Held: The respondent newspaper refused to publish an unpaid announcement (with photograph) of the complainant's same sex civil union with those of marriages similarly submitted. The complainant alleged a denial of a public accommodation under General Statutes § 46a-64 on the basis of sexual orientation and marital status. The respondent claimed First Amendment protection in the exercise of its editorial discretion. Held*:* while there have been legally recognized encroachments on a newspaper's First Amendment rights so as to advance other competing governmental and public interests, such encroachments have not been found in Connecticut (or elsewhere) to extend to the content of unpaid public/personal announcements in a newspaper under the theory that it is a public accommodation. Without a basis for determining that the respondent was a public accommodation for these purposes, the complainant was found to have failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

Crebase, John v. Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals
0330171
FitzGerald, 09/07/05

The respondent's motion for sanctions granted. The respondent moved that the complainant be sanctioned for failure to comply with the presiding human rights referee's order to produce documents. The complainant is sanctioned as follows: (1) it is established that the respondent did not terminate the complainant's employment because of his mental disorder; (2) no evidence shall be introduced that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his mental disorder and (3) no evidence shall be introduced that the complainant has a mental disorder.

Crebase, John v Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals
0330171
(appeal withdrawn)
FitzGerald, 07/12/06

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant established that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) (Title VII) and 46a-60 (a) when it terminated his employment because of his age, sex and mental disability. The complainant was awarded damages including two years of back pay, reinstatement, pre-and post-judgment interest, and emotional distress.

Cuffee, Tampiepko Tion v. Nine West Group, Inc.
9720038
Trojanowski, 5/7/99

Motion to dismiss granted the joint motion from the commission and the respondent based on the complainant's failure to respond to written and telephonic conversations for over a year.

Czuchra, Roger A. v. Pace Motor Lines
0820039
Austin, 10/22/10

The respondent's motion to subpoena witness to a deposition denied. The respondent argued that CGS 51-85 authorized the issuance of a subpoena to depose a witness it intended to call at trial. The respondent further proffered that given that the intended witness gave testimony that conflicted with a previously sworn to affidavit, good cause existed to issue a subpoena. Held: CGS 51-85 does not authorize the issuance of a subpoena to depose a witness in agency proceedings and that the conflict between the testimony and affidavit can be brought out at trial.

Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck
8330054
Wilkerson, 8/10/99

Order for relief on remand. Calculation of backpay. Held*:* (1) the complainant vigorously litigated her discrimination claim for damages and is entitled to full amount of backpay; (2) prejudgment interest is an appropriate element in a backpay award; and (3) fringe benefits are an appropriate element in a backpay award.

Dako-Smith, Frederica v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services
0020228 & 0220142
(appeal dismissed)
Austin, 04/12/07

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. African-American complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her by subjecting her to disparate treatment and a hostile work environment. In Case No. 0220142 the complainant alleged as a result of her filing with CHRO the respondent retaliated against her by filing a complaint with the Connecticut Department of Health. Held: the complainant failed to sustain her burden of proving a prima facie case in both complaints as to claims of discrimination and retaliation. (Transcript of decision)

Danner, Stephanie v ATOS IT Solutions and Services, Inc.
1730314 (on appeal, remanded)
Wright, 02/22/2019

Motion for summary judgment. In her complaint, the complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her on the basis of her mental disability and retaliated against her. In its motion for summary judgment, the respondent argued that the complainant cannot establish the prima facie elements of her case because there was no reasonable accommodation that it could provide to enable her to perform the essential functions of her job. Further, it argued that the complainant could not refute its legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for terminating her employment, namely layoffs over an extended period of time. The respondent filed supporting affirmative evidence and affidavits in support of its position. The complainant provided no affidavits or other evidence to establish a factual basis for the challenged elements. *Held*: motion granted. The complainant and commission failed to offer any counter affidavits or evidentiary material to demonstrate the existence of genuine issues of material facts.

D'Angelo, Edward v. University of Bridgeport
9520184, 9520185, 9520186
Allen, 6/29/99

Motion to dismiss granted due to failure of complainants to file complaints with the commission within the 180-day period following alleged act of discrimination.

Daniels, Elbert v. U. S. Security Associates, Inc.
0430286
Trojanowski, 11/17/04

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged he had been discriminated against on the basis of his race. The complainant was awarded back pay and prejudgment interest. respondent also ordered to reimburse the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Daniels, Jeffrey v Andre Ruellan
0550012
Kerr, 11/6/06

Final decision. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in being denied rental housing on the basis of disability and source of income. The respondent denied the claim based on disability and rebutted the source of income claim by stating that his denial was predicated on the permissible consideration of insufficient income. Held: The disability claim was dismissed for lack of evidence and judgment for the complainant was entered on the source of income claim. The formula the respondent had used to determine insufficient income was legally flawed, and could be applied so as to eliminate virtually all Section 8 applicants. The complainant was awarded $4275 plus interest for all claims (which sum

included a small award for emotional distress) and complainant's counsel was awarded a discounted attorney's fee in the amount of $10,150.

Davis, Keith A. v. Mama Bears LLC
0430103
FitzGerald, 08/29/05

The commission's motion to amend the complaint to add a respondent denied without prejudice because there was no verification that the motion and proposed amendment had been received by the proposed respondent. As a matter of due process, the proposed respondent is entitled to notice and opportunity to be heard on the motion.

DeBarros, Paula v Hartford Roofing, Co., Inc.
0430162
Trojanowski, 05/10/05

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged sexual harassment because of her sex and constructive discharge because of the harassment. The complainant was awarded back pay of $15,223.30; health insurance benefits of $8,254.82, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Demmerle, Mark v New England Stair Co.
1730020
Wright, 01/03/2019

Motion to dismiss. The complainant alleged that the respondent retaliated against him for his previous filing of an employment discrimination complaint against the respondent, then his employer. The alleged act of retaliation was an email sent to the complainant by the respondent's senior vice president of sales which the complainant found threatening. In its motion to dismiss, the respondent contends that the commission does not have subject matter jurisdiction over post-employment actions involving of a former employee and because the adverse action complained of involved the exercise of protected constitutional or statutory rights and privileges of the respondent. *Held*: motion denied. There is no evidence constitutional rights or privileges implicated in this claim of retaliation and the facts as alleged and those necessarily implied are sufficient to state a cause of action for retaliation.

DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen
9830057
Giliberto, 7/22/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Motion to amend granted in part. Held*:* (1) Complaint may be amended to correct statutory bases for discrimination; (2) General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) imposes individual liability; (3) complaint may be amended to cite in the proper respondent; (4) claim pursuant to § 46a-60(a)(5) may not be added to the complaint.

DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen
9830057
Giliberto, 8/17/99

Motion to dismiss federal claims granted in part. Federal claims under ADEA and ADA are dismissed due to employer having less than minimum number of employees.

DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen
9830057
Giliberto, 8/20/99

Motion to stay pending declaratory ruling from the commission denied. Held*:* (1) Executive Director cannot file motions as she is represented by the commission counsel; (2) Chief Human Rights Referee performs administrative function and cannot rule in place of presiding human rights referees; (3) We have duty to address matters in more expedient fashion than the court system; and (4) Declaratory Rulings are no more binding than final decisions in other contested cases and do not require halt to all potentially related proceedings.

Dexter, Frank v. Dept. of Correction
0320165
FitzGerald, 08/31/2005

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The respondent terminated the complainant's employment as a correction officer because he violated the administrative directive against undue familiarity with inmates by using his personal cell phone to make calls on behalf of inmates. The complainant, an African-American, alleged that the respondent did not terminate non-African Americans who had been cited for undue familiarity. Held: the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case because of his repeated violations of the administrative directive and because the non-African American correction officers to whom he compared himself were not similarly situated as their conduct were not as severe as the complainant's. Even if the prima facie elements were established, the complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent's business reason was a pretext for actual discrimination.

DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc.
0420438
Kerr, 9/12/06

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon sexual harassment and retaliatory dismissal. The complainant was awarded back pay ($7,220), lost benefits ($3,699), emotional distress ($6,000) and prejudgment interest ($4,740).

DiMicco, Rosa v Neil Roberts, Inc.
0420438
Kerr, 11/16/06

Final decision on reconsideration. The complainant requested a reconsideration of the final decision dated September 12, 2006, wherein the referee declined to award attorney's fees because the complainant supplied inadequate documentation to support an award. Held: After granting the motion to reconsider, and reviewing a detailed itemized bill with proposed hourly rates, the referee awarded $10,369.39 in attorney's fees, rejecting the proposed lodestar fee of $17,282.31 as unreasonable and out of proportion with the effort put forth and the result obtained.

Doe, Jane v. Claywell Electric
0510199
Kerr, 12/09/08

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon sexual discrimination/harassment and constructive discharge. The complainant was awarded back pay ($3,120), emotional distress ($15,000) and prejudgment interest ($1,310).

Doe (1993) Jane v. Ice Cream Delight
9310191
Trojanowski, 9/1/99

Hearing In damages. Part-time yogurt store worker who was sexually harassed and terminated requested monetary damages consisting of back pay, front pay and compound interest. Held*:* (1) The complainant was entitled to two years back pay which terminated when she obtained a higher paying job; (2) the complainant was not entitled to front pay because she was made whole economically by the award of backpay; (3) the awarding of interest and whether it is compounded is in the discretion of the presiding human rights referee, compound pre-judgment interest awarded on the award of backpay from the date of the discriminatory act; (4) statutory post-judgment interest; and (5) various equitable remedies.

Downes, Elizabeth v. zUniversity.com
0210366
Trojanowski, 9/12/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant was terminated because of her sex, familial status and her pregnancy. Damages included back pay, performance bonus, and money for medical coverage.

Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut
9730257
FitzGerald, 8/18/00

The respondent's motion to dismiss a portion of the complaint that was incorporated by an amendment is granted. The amendment alleges essentially the same facts as a subsequent complaint filed by the complainant against the respondent. Because the complainant obtained a release of jurisdiction under §§ 46a-100 and –101 of the subsequent complaint, General Statutes § 46a-101(d) waives the commission's jurisdiction as to allegations for which the release was obtained, proscribes the commission from continuing to prosecute the allegations, and requires the dismissal of the allegations in whatever form the allegations may take.

Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut
9730257
FitzGerald, 9/15/00

Motion to dismiss granted. The commission moved for an administrative dismissal pursuant to a request by the complainant for a release of jurisdiction.

DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp.
0920414 (1120319)
Wilson, 07/03/2013

Age, 46a-58, Age Discrimination in Employment Act

Motion to dismiss the General Statute Section 46a-58 is granted. The complainant alleges in part that the respondent discriminated against her on the basis of her age in violation of General Statute Section 46a-60(a)(1), and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act as enforced through General Statute Section 46a-58. Age is not one of the enumerated protected classes in Section 46a-58.

DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp.
0920414 (1120319)
Wilson, 07/15/2013

Motion to dismiss. Jurisdiction – federal claims; jurisdiction – minimum number of employees

Respondent's motion to dismiss the Section 46a-60 claims for lack of jurisdiction is denied because at the time of the filing of the complaint the respondent had at least three employees of whom at least one was employed in Connecticut.

DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp.
0920414
Wilson, 09/19/2014

Statistics, age, retaliation, reduction in force

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant filed two complaints, 0920414 and 1120319, in which she alleged in her first complaint that illegally terminated her employment because of her age and, in her second complaint, later refused to hire her in retaliation for her filing of the first complaint. *Held*: there was insufficient evidence to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reasons for the actions it took.

Duncan, Clive v CT Trane
0410319
Kerr, 06/01/06

Motion to stay denied. The motion to stay was predicated on the filing of an action in federal court one month prior to the complaint's certification. The motion claimed that a stay was necessary to preserve (from the threat of preclusion) a right to a federal jury trial and to avoid duplication of effort. The motion was denied because the dual filing was at the complainant's option, preclusion issues could arise whether the stay was granted or not and because no compelling reason was advanced to indefinitely disenfranchise the commission from its statutory obligation to prosecute discrimination complaints.

Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University
0130315, 0230323
Wilkerson, 11/29/05

Final decision. Judgment, in part, for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against the complainant by 1) failing to respond to her continued reports of workplace harassment by both co-workers and management; 2) by treating her dissimilarly to other employees in trial periods; and 3) by suspending and ultimately terminating her because she is a transgendered woman with a mental disability who was, or was perceived to be homosexual, and in retaliation for participating in the University's grievance process and filing a CHRO complaint. Held*:* The respondent violated General Statutes § 46a-81c(1) by creating a hostile work environment based on the complainant's sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation during her employment at one of its facilities when it failed to take reasonable steps to remedy the hostile work environment. The respondent is liable to the complainant for her injuries. The complainant is entitled to an award of back pay along with 10% pre and post-judgment interest. The commission and the complainant failed to prove that the respondent discriminated, retaliated or aided and abetted discrimination against the complainant for the lost promotions, demotions, poor evaluations, being placed on probation, failure to accommodate, and the suspension and termination and those claims are dismissed.

Duarte, James v. Hamilton Standard
9610553
Giliberto, 9/30/99

Motion to dismiss denied in part. Held*: (*1) The complainant alleged facts sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of disability discrimination; (2) employers have a duty under state law to make reasonable accommodations; (3) General Statutes § 46a-58(a) does not apply to discriminatory employment practices that fall under the federal statutes; and (4) the commission does have jurisdiction over federal claims of discrimination.

Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley
0840162
Mount, 04/18/2018

Age, aiding and abetting, job performance, stray remarks, statistical evidence, reduction in force, similarly situated, insubordination

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Ellis, John v. ACE International (ACE American Ins. Co.)
0620473
FitzGerald, 09/13/10

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. The complainant's § 46a-58 (a), Title VII retaliation and ADEA claims dismissed. Commission lacks jurisdiction because retaliation and age are not enumerated as protected bases under § 46a-58 (a). Motion dismissed as to the complainant's § 46a-60 (a) (4) retaliation claim as (1) the claim is not time-barred and (2) whether the alleged acts would dissuade a reasonable worker from making or supporting a charge of discrimination is an evidentiary matter not a jurisdictional defect.

Ellis, John v. ACE International (ACE American Ins. Co.)
0620473
FitzGerald, 10/25/10

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent asserted lack of subject matter jurisdiction, lack of personal jurisdiction and improper extraterritorial application of state's anti-discrimination laws. Held: (1) the commission has subject matter jurisdiction under § 46a-60 over a claim that an employee was terminated because of his age an in retaliation for his opposition to discriminatory employment practices; (2) a decision made in Connecticut that has extraterritorial effect does not make the application of the law extraterritorial and

Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws may, in some cases be applied extraterritorially; and, (3) the commission and the complainant established that the commission's exercise of personal jurisdiction satisfies statutory and constitutional requirements.

Esposito, Armando v. City of New London
9340530
Allen, 10/21/99

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) General Statutes §§ 7-430 and 46a-60(b)(1)(C) provide that age 65 is a legislatively accepted BFOQ for firefighters in Connecticut; and (2) the evidence submitted in this matter establishes that age 65 is a BFOQ for municipal firefighters.

Feroleto, Salvatore v. Dept. of Mental Retardation
0510140
Knishkowy, 8/27/07

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent employer moved to dismiss complaint (or portions thereof) as untimely because some of the alleged discriminatory acts occurred beyond the statutory filing period. The filing requirement is not jurisdictional, but is like a statute of limitations, with which one must comply absent factors such as waiver, consent or equitable tolling. (1) Although untimely discrete acts may be barred even if they are related to timely acts, the vaguely-asserted allegations in the complaint lack details and pertinent dates; only after further evidence can this tribunal determine which acts fall within, and which beyond, the filing period. (2) Because the complainant alleges ongoing harassment (due to his disability), he is entitled to adduce evidence at trial to demonstrate a hostile work environment, which would toll the filing requirement. (3) The complainant should also be allowed to adduce evidence to show that the other actions alleged in his complaint (e.g., ongoing unequal pay, ongoing denial of reasonable accommodations) constitute a "policy or practice" of discrimination, which might also toll the filing requirement.

Ferri, Susan v Darien Barber Shop
0520471
FitzGerald, 4/15/08

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent claimed the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the complaint was brought against a trade name. Held: Courts have held that a trade name may be named as a defendant in an action. Further, by entering an appearance, an attorney acknowledges that the party named on the appearance form is an accurate legal designation of the party for purposes of the trial

Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority
0050061
Wilkerson, 10/04/01

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The respondent discriminated against the complainant who was disabled by failing to reasonably accommodate him in housing. The complainant proved a prima facie case of failure to reasonably accommodate. The respondent did not meet its burden to prove that the accommodation was unreasonable. The complainant was awarded $2,500 for emotional distress damages with post-judgment interest, $7,497 for back rental fees paid with pre- and post-judgment interest, and the complainant's attorney was awarded $5,850 for attorney fees with post-judgment interest. The complainant was also awarded $252 (differential rental fee) per month until the respondent grants him a Section 8 certificate for his current dwelling.

Flood, Robert v. American Can Company
8220420
FitzGerald, 4/24/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was the victim of age discrimination that occurred when the respondent, undergoing a reduction in force, failed to transfer the complainant into a lateral job position. Held*:* the complainant failed to prove his prima facie case, that the respondent's reason was pretextual, and that he was the victim of intentional age discrimination.

Franuenhofer, Ann v Ascent Service & Technologies, LLC
1010090
Wilson, 06/03/2013

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment because of her participation in a protective activity. *Held*: the complainant's evidence failed to establish that the respondent's proffered legitimate business reason was a pretext for retaliation or to show that the respondent possessed a retaliatory motive.

Friedman, Sharon v. Office of the State Comptroller
0110195
Allen, 11/17/03

The complainant made application for "domestic partner benefits" and was denied same on basis that state arbitration award providing such benefits applied only to same sex partners as they were unable to marry under state law. The complainant alleged that she was discriminated against by the arbitration award, because her "partner" was male, on the basis of her marital status and sexual orientation the respondent moved to dismiss complaint for failure to state a claim for which relief could be afforded. HELD: the respondent's Motion to Dismiss granted as Chapter 68 of the CGS (Section 5-276 et seq.) provides for finality of

such an award unless a timely motion to vacate is filed with the Superior Court, and there having been none the award is not now subject to a collateral attack through the auspices of a CHRO complaint.

Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

The respondent's "motion to preclude relitigation of factual findings in *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* and to preclude relitigation of certain legal issues as a result of the *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* decision" is denied. The respondent argued that the doctrine of collateral estoppel should apply so as to preclude the relitigation of the factual and legal findings determined in connection with the final decision issued in *O'Halloran*. Collateral estoppel is inapplicable for at least three reasons. First, the presiding referee concluded that O'Halloran did not prove discrimination; he did not conclude that the respondent did not discriminate. Second, in *O'Halloran*, the presiding referee specifically noted that: he did not intend his findings in *O'Halloran* to be applied to the merits of this case. Finally, under the facts of this case, the policies underlying collateral estoppel and the anti-discrimination statutes favor not applying collateral estoppel.

Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine is granted to preclude evidence of qualifications unknown to the decision-maker at the time of the hiring decision. Under the "after-acquired evidence" doctrine, information that was unknown to the decision-maker at the time he made his decision could not have influenced his decision and, therefore, is irrelevant as to his motivation in choosing whom to hire.

Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine seeking to preclude the introduction of evidence regarding any emotional distress damages is denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it refused to hire her for the position of zoning inspector because of her sex. Although emotional distress damages are not available for a violation of § 46a-60, the complainant's damage claims also arise from the respondent's alleged unlawful practices under Title VII, which would constitute a violation of § 46a-58 (a) and afford the complainant the relief, including emotional distress damages, available under General Statute § 46a-86 (c).

Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141
FitzGerald, 07/10/09

Motion for reconsideration of the ruling sustaining the respondent's in limine objection to the testimony of Josephine O'Halloran is denied. First, as proffered by the commission, O'Halloran's proposed testimony offered no obvious or logical connection to the issue of the respondent's alleged discriminatory conduct toward the complainant. Second, O'Halloran is not a "similarly situated" witness. Third, the commission provided no specific as to the discriminatory treatment of the complainant that O'Halloran personally observed and also provided no specific information as to what testimony O'Halloran could corroborate that would both need corroboration and also not be unduly repetitious.

Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141
FitzGerald, 12/28/09

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant was one of four applicants (three females and one male) for the position of zoning inspector. The respondent hired the male applicant for the position. The complainant alleged that she was not hired because of her sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of her sex when it did not hire her for the position of zoning inspector.

Gallant, Michelle v. Torrad Assoc. LLC.
1830431
FitzGerald, 02/18/2022

The complainant filed a complaint alleging, in part, that her son had been denied medical services in retaliation for the child's father having previously filed a discrimination complaint with the commission. The respondent moved to dismiss arguing, in part, that the child was not within the zone of interests under the statutes. *Held:* motion denied. General Statutes §§ 46a-60(b)(4) and 46a-64 provide a cause of action for associational discrimination.

Garceau, Mary Beth v Yale University
0530073
FitzGerald, 12/05/05

Motion to compel granted in part. Inter alia, the respondent, pursuant to General Statutes § 31-128f (2), was ordered to produce disciplinary records.

Garcia, Dionne v CT Family Care LLC
1340202
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Corrected Hearing in Damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay of $4,650 and post-judgment interest.

Genovese, Lisa v. Ultimate Billiards
0530337
FitzGerald, 02/09/07

Hearing in damages. The executive director defaulted the respondent for failing to respond to the commission's pre-certification interrogatories (General Statutes § 46a-54). The complainant was awarded back pay, front pay, reimbursement of medical costs that would have been paid through the respondent's employee medical benefit package, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

George, Thomas v Town of West Hartford
0910466
Wilson, 10/01/2015

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated the Americans with Disabilities Act as enforced under General Statute 46a-58(a) when it failed to make a modification to its refuse and recycling collection services. *Held:* the it is not a violation of the ADA for a public entity to refuse to perform any function for the benefit of any individual that exceeds their physical abilities so long as the public entity does not perform that service for able-bodied resident.

Gill, Rosemarie v. Hartford Public Schools
0010417
Knishkowy, 2/14/02

Ruling on interrogatories. Held*:* Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production/disclosure of documents.

Gillmore, Alexis v. Mothers Works, Inc.
0330195
Trojanowski, 9/30/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant was terminated because of her gender, familial status and her pregnancy. Damages included back pay.

Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury
9530587
(appeal withdrawn)
Allen, 8/11/00

Hearing in damages. The complainant was awarded: (1) back pay; (2) attorney's fees; and (3) prejudgment interest.

Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury
9530587
Allen, 9/7/00

Motion for reconsideration granted. The complainant's back pay award reduced by the sum of $44,076.00 which had been awarded to the complainant in previous court decision involving the same parties.

Gomez, Isabel v. United Security, Inc.
9930490
(appeal dismissed)
Trojanowski, 1/28/00

Hearing in damages. Female security guard awarded: (1) back pay; (2) pre-judgment interest; and (3) statutory post-judgment interest.

Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash
0330082
Wilkerson, 02/08/06

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held: The complainant proved that the respondent's proffered business reason for terminating his employment was false, but he failed to prove that the false reason was a pretext for discrimination. The record revealed non-discriminatory reasons for the termination and, therefore, the complainant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent terminated him because of his Puerto Rican ancestry.

Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital
9530477
Knishkowy, 10/13/99

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant failed to prove that her discharge was the result of unlawful discrimination based on race, color, or disability. The respondent articulated—and convincingly proved—a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the discharge; i.e., the complainant could not perform her essential job duties even with reasonable accommodation, and there were no other positions to which she could reasonably be assigned. Furthermore, the respondent satisfied its duty to reasonably accommodate the complainant.

Green, Devon v. SNET Co.
9420217
Knishkowy, 4/12/00

Ruling on interrogatories. Held*:* Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to Requests for Production.

Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington
9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(On appeal, dismissed in part and remanded to referee in part; see suppl. decision)
Trojanowski, 1/26/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) The complainants failed to prove that they were paid less than certain male employees for equal work on jobs whose performance requires equal skill, effort and responsibility and which are performed under similar working conditions. (2) the respondent's Job Study, introduced by The complainants to prove their case, was disallowed because it only measured two of the statutory criteria required by the Equal Pay Act and did not measure effort or performance under similar working conditions. (3) The complainants failed to prove discriminatory intent by the respondent in paying them less than comparable male employees. (4) the respondent's jurisdictional argument that the commission was precluded from considering the complainants' complaints because there have been prior arbitrator's decisions on the same or similar issues as those before the Human Rights Referee, was denied because there was no written or verbal waiver of statutory rights to a hearing before the commission by the complainants or their collective bargaining agent.

Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington
9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(on appeal; appeal dismissed)
Trojanowski, 7/13/01 (Supplemental decision)

The appeal was dismissed as to the presiding referee's dismissal of the complainants' EPA claim and remanded for further analysis of their Title VII and CFEPA claims. On remand, Held*:* Complaint dismissed. The complainant's failed to show the males to whom they compared themselves held similar or comparable jobs and failed to show discriminatory animus by the respondents.

Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford
0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
FitzGerald, 7/1/02

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: (1) The complainant established that she was discriminated against in promotional opportunities on the basis of her race. The

respondent's articulated non-discriminatory reason found to be pretextual. The discrimination constituted a continuing violation. The complainant's failure to formally apply for a promotion excused as her application would have been a futile. The complainant is awarded back pay and a promotion retroactive to September 13, 1998. (2) The complainant's claim of discrimination based upon her disability was dismissed.

Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford
0010273
FitzGerald, 3/12/03

Supplement to final decision. Clarification and itemization of monetary damages.

Hansberry, Phyllis v. Eddie Eckhaus
0250114
Wilkerson, 5/23/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant who possessed a section 8 voucher attempted to rent a home from the respondent who refused to accept the voucher and would not allow the complainant to apply to rent the house. Discrimination based on lawful source of income and public advertising. The complainant awarded emotional distress damages of $2,500, $931 for rent differential, $862.94 for storage costs and attorney fees.

Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services
0020220
Wilkerson, 11/14/01

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* Under state law, the respondent discriminated against the complainant because of her age, 66, at the time of filing the complaint by terminating her employment. The complainant's federal claim was dismissed because the respondent did not employ at least 20 employees. The complainant proved a prima facie case of age discrimination in employment. The complainant proved that the respondent's proffered reason was unworthy of credence and therefore, pretextual. The complainant was awarded $14,493.00 for back pay with $1,449.00 for prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest at 10% for the unpaid balance.

Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corporation
9710649, 9710650
(appeal withdrawn)
Allen, 4/25/00

Final decision. Judgment for complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant established prima facie case in failure to hire age discrimination case and the respondent's legitimate reason was pretextual; (2) the complainant sufficiently met requirement for application for position as part of his prima facie case by applying for and expressing interest in specific classes of positions; (3) Damages awarded reduced due to failure of the complainant to fully mitigate his losses by virtue of his quitting subsequent employment at another job; and (4) The complainant

awarded: (a) $65, 037 in damages with interest compounded at the rate of 10%/year as of the date the position was filled by a younger person (b) the respondents ordered to hire the complainant to one of eleven positions; (c) the respondents ordered to provide retroactive pension benefits; (d) the respondents ordered to provide benefits until the complainant is rehired, or until he reaches age 66; and (e) the respondents ordered to pay the complainant $5,000.00/year front pay until he is rehired, or until age 66.

Hartling, Judy v. Jeffrey Carfi
0550116
Knishkowy, 10/26/06

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondents liable for retaliation (in response to prior CHRO complaint) and for housing discrimination and harassment based on the complainant's sexual orientation. Pursuant to §46a-86(c) the referee awarded the complainant $1315 for various costs and $25,000 for emotional distress damages.

Helliger, Patricia v. Avalon Properties
9730397
Allen, 12/20/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) the respondent Real Estate Management Corporation and its named agents discriminated against the complainant by making a rental opportunity unavailable and by misrepresenting the availability of a rental in violation of §§ 46a-64c(a)(1) and 46a-64c(a)(4)(A); (2) complainant awarded $3,000.00 damages suffered as a result of emotional distress at discriminatory treatment; (3) the complainant failed to mitigate her economic losses and no economic compensatory damages awarded.

Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores
9510617
Manzione, 7/22/99

Motion to dismiss postponed for evidentiary hearing. Held*:* There are questions of fact as to whether the complaint against additional named respondents should be dismissed (i.e. whether "successor liability" should attach and whether to "pierce the corporate veil"). Accordingly, a conference call shall be scheduled to discuss limited discovery on this issue and set a date for an evidentiary hearing on this jurisdictional question.

Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores
9510617
Manzione, 9/1/99

Ruling on the respondents' motion to dismiss and the commission's motion for stay. Held*:* (1) A parent corporation may be dismissed from an action when allegations are brought against its subsidiary for discriminatory treatment based on disability where the corporate veil of the parent is not able to be pierced under either the "instrumentality" or "identity" rule;

(2) Successor liability does not attach to a company that purchased all of the assets of a predecessor company through a Purchase Agreement that specifically did not assume any liabilities and therefore said “successor” company is dismissed; and (3) A motion for stay is not granted based on the outcome of a pending declaratory ruling before the commission because the ruling has no more weight than a decision in a contested case proceeding and the timeliness of the outcome is uncertain.

Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health
9710032
(appeal dismissed)
Manzione, 10/6/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The respondent is ordered to promote the complainant and pay her backpay with simple interest. Although the complainant did not formally apply for the position when it was posted, she made enough efforts to find out about the position while she was out on a maternity/medical leave to meet the application requirement under *McDonnell Douglas*. She should have been considered for the position and had she been considered, she would have been hired based on her education, training, experience and status as an affirmative action goal candidate.

Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon
1550288 (appeal pending)
Wright, 06/12/2017

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged that her neighbor, the respondent, harassed and threatened her on the basis of her race and color. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $157.15 in reimbursement for travel expenses and $15,000 in emotional distress damages. *(On appeal, remanded for further consideration of damages in light of Patino v Birken Manufacturing Co., 304 Conn 679 (2012).*

Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon
1550288 (appeal pending)
Wright, 08/17/2018

Hearing in damages on remand. The complainant alleged that her neighbor, the respondent, harassed and threatened her on the basis of her race and color. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $157.15 in reimbursement for travel expenses and $15,000 in emotional distress damages.

Hogan, Ashley v H&H Promotions, Inc.
1720211
Wright, 09/06/2018

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $12,120 in backpay, $30,000 in emotional distress damages, and post-judgement interest.

Hudson, Betsy v New London Public Schools
0840264
Wilson, 04/06/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent demoted and transferred her because of her race and sex. *Held*: the complainant did not establish a prima facie case because there was insufficient evidence to create an inference of discriminatory animus based on her protected status. Further, even if the complainant established a prima facie case, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason.

Intagliata, Debra J. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.
9740381
Giliberto, 7/31/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held*:* (1) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case of retaliation due to her failure to prove she complained about discriminatory employment practices and failure to prove any adverse action; and (2) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case of gender discrimination due to her failure to prove that the male employee that replaced her was similarly situated and failure to prove any adverse action or inference of salary discrimination due to gender.

Isler, Jacqueline v. Yale-New Haven Hospital
9730024
Manzione, 3/3/99

Ruling on Discovery Motions. Held*:* (1) There is no authority for interrogatories at the commission; (2) human rights referees may grant or deny motions to compel on specific discovery issues.

Jackson, Gloria v. Debra Lutkowski and Paul Pixbey
0950094 & 0950095
Austin, 5/25/10

Hearing in Damages. The complainant had alleged that she was harassed due to her race and color by her neighbors (the respondents). The complainant was awarded damages for emotional distress (anxiety along with loss of weight and sleep) and for damage caused to her car.

Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden
9730288
FitzGerald, 4/6/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant, a firefighter, alleged a violation of General Statutes § 46a-60(a) on the basis of age (65) when the respondent involuntarily retired him under its mandatory retirement policy. Held*:* The respondent's mandatory retirement age of 65 for its firefighters is a per se statutory bona fide occupational qualification under §§ 7-430 and 46a-60(b)(1)(C). The complaint is dismissed.

Joiner, David v. H.E.R.E. Local 217
0410177
Austin, 07/21/06

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent, his union, denied him representation and also aided and abetted his employer in denying him seniority rights he was entitled to under the collective bargaining agreement. Because resolution of the merits of the complaint would have required interpreting the collective bargaining agreement, the complaint was dismissed as preempted by § 301 of the federal Labor and Management Relations Act.

Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction
9740163
Giliberto, 8/20/99

Motion to stay pending declaratory ruling from the commission Denied. Held*:* (1) executive director cannot file motions as she is represented by the commission counsel; (2) chief human rights referee performs administrative function and cannot rule in place of presiding human rights referees; (3) human rights referees have duty to address matters in more expedient fashion than the court system; and (4) declaratory rulings are no more binding than final decisions in other contested cases and do not require halt to all potentially related proceedings.

Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction
9740163
Giliberto, 3/9/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) The complainant is an "individual with a disability" due to her physical impairments of asthma and degenerative arthritis which are found to substantially limit the major life activities of breathing and walking; (2) the complainant was not qualified to perform the essential functions of her job and therefore failed to set forth a prima facie case under the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act; (3) the complainant's impairments of asthma and degenerative arthritis meet the definition of "physically disabled" under state law and the complainant established a prima facie case under state law; (4) the respondent proved the safety defense and her physical disabilities prevent her from performing her job.

Kaplan, David v AFSCME Council #4
121003
Bromley, 05/21/2014

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent denied him a position as a legislative field organizer because of his in violation of General Statute 46a-60(a)(1) and the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). *Held*: ADEA claim dismissed because this forum has no jurisdiction over ADEA claims. Section 46a-60(a)(1) claim dismissed because the respondent had made all its hiring selections for the available openings by the time that the complainant applied for the position.

Kelly, Brian v. City of New Britain
0210359
Trojanowski, 10/18/04

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent argued that (1) the complainant not physically disabled as defined under the ADA, Rehabilitation Act, or § 46a-60(a)(1) and (2) the complaint was barred by the statute of limitations because it was filed more than 180 days after the filing of the complaint. The respondent's first argument is more properly a motion for summary judgment and was treated as such. The motion denied in its entirety.

Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University
0140203
FitzGerald, 12/27/04

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment because of her sex, her disability, and in retaliation for her requesting accommodations for her disability. Held*:* the commission and the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's articulated business reason was a pretext for discrimination. Also, a violation of Title VII or the Rehabilitation Act is a violation of § 46a-58(a) and would entitle the commission and the complainant to the remedies available under § 46a-86(c).

Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University
0140203
FitzGerald, 01/28/05

The commission's motion to reconsider the final decision denied.

Kinder, Anthony v. Dept. of Children and Families
0730367
Kerr, 4/21/10

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in being denied a promotion to the position of social work supervisor because of his race (African-American) and color (black), in violation of General Statutes § 46a-58 (a), 46a-60 (a) (1) and Title Vll. Because of the manifold safety valves built in to the interview and selection process by the respondent to safeguard against discriminatory animus interjecting itself into the selection process, the racial and ethnic composition of the interview panels and the diversity and qualifications of the successful candidates, the complainant was unable to establish a prima-facie case.

Kitchens, John v Specialty Transportation
1010206
Wilson, 03/02/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held: The evidence failed to establish that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his age.

Kondratowicz, Stephen v. Pleasant Valley Mobile Home Park
0250051
FitzGerald, 6/4/02

Motion to amend the complaint granted. The commission's motion granted to amend complaint adding three respondents and an additional act of retaliation. The commission's motion was timely filed, no showing of prejudice to the respondents, and the additional respondents will enable a complete determination of the issues.

Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain
9810482
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 3/15/02

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Three public school employees were transferred to other schools because their strained and volatile interpersonal relationships demonstrated a potential for disruption in the school where all three worked. The complainant brought this action against the city, the board of education, and two administrators, alleging that the transfer was based on her mental disability and her sexual orientation. Held: (1) complainant failed to meet her prima facie case for each claim, because her transfer was not an "adverse employment action;" (2) complainant failed to demonstrate, for purposes of her prima facie burden, that she was transferred "because of" her disability; (3) complainant failed to demonstrate, for purposes of her prima facie burden, any circumstances giving rise to an inference of discrimination based on her sexual orientation; (4) individual respondents not liable, as matter of law, under ADA, General Statutes §46a-60(a)(1), or §46a-81c; (5)

complainant failed to prove facts showing individual respondents aided or abetted discriminatory practice in violation of §46a-60(a)(5).

L'Annunziata, Paul v. New Horizons Learning Center
0210153
FitzGerald, 08//07/2003

Motion to amend complaint granted. Complaint may be amended to change a date and to add the respondent's parent corporation as a respondent.

Langan, Kevin v. RCK Corp. dba JP Dempsey's
0730256
Knishkowy, 1/15/09

Motion to compel granted. The complainant was terminated from his position as "bar manager" in the respondent restaurant, allegedly because of his disabilities (real and/or perceived). The commission filed request for production that included requests for information about other employees--information likely found in personnel files. The respondent objected to certain requests for disclosure as overly burdensome, not "germane" to the complaint, and protected by the privacy rights of other employees. Ruling: (1) a claim of "unduly burdensome" requires some explanation of the nature of the burden; mere recitation of the phrase is insufficient; (2) because the complainant/commission are comparing the respondent's treatment of the complainant with that of other employees, certain information about other employees may be relevant or, when disclosed, may lead to the discovery of relevant information; (3) Although General Statutes § 31-128f protects the confidentiality and integrity of personnel files, there are several narrow exceptions, one of which allows disclosure "pursuant to a lawfully issued administrative summons or judicial order . . . or in response to . . . the investigation or defense of personnel-related complaints against the employer."

Latef, Roberts v Judicial Department, State of Connecticut
1030184
Wilson, 06/13/2014

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. *Held*: evidence presented failed to establish that the respondent articulated reason for failing to hire the complainant as a permanent employee at the end of his probation period, because he had not acquired the necessary skills, was a pretext for discrimination.

Lauray, Mark v City Hall Café
1530333
Wright, 03/31/2016

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $831 in backpay and $8,000 in emotional distress damages.

Lawton, Kimberly v. Chad Jansen
0550135
Austin, 10/18/07

Hearing in damages: The complainant who was harassed due to her race and color by a teenage neighbor brought an action under state and federal fair housing laws. The complainant was awarded damages for emotional distress, lost wages, and attorney's fees. The complainant's claims for damages against the teenager's mother pursuant to General Statutes § 52-572 and common law negligent supervisor were not allowed.

Leftridge, Rachael v. Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield
9830218
Knishkowy, 1/22/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. African-American complainant alleged that the respondent failed to promote her because of her race. The complainant had worked for the respondent for nine years, yet the promotion was given to a white co-worker who had only worked for one year. Although the complainant was qualified for the promotion and met her prima facie case, the respondent justified its decision by demonstrating that the promoted employee was better qualified. The complainant failed to show that the respondent's reason lacked credence or that it masked an unlawful discriminatory motive.

Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford
0520402
Wilkerson, 08/30/07

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* an alleged discriminatory decision to deny the complainant an accommodation made prior to the 180 days of the filing of the complaint that was referenced in a second alleged discriminatory decision to deny an accommodation that was made within the 180 days of the filing the complaint shall not be dismissed as untimely. The allegation outside of the 180 days is relevant because it directly relates to the timely made allegations of the complaint and shows that the respondent engaged in a pattern of discriminatory practice.

Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford
0520402
(on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Wilkerson, 04/08/08

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: The respondent discriminated against the complainant by failing to accommodate the complainant's learning disability when it denied him a reasonable accommodation to take an exam. The respondent failed to engage in an interactive process with the complainant. The respondent did not prove its safety defense or its defense that the exam was job-related. The complainant's claims of failure to promote, denied raise and differential rate of pay are dismissed. The complainant was awarded the accommodation of additional time to take the captain promotional exam and if he obtained the required score, he was awarded the captain position. If no captain position is available, the respondent would pay the complainant the difference in the captain and lieutenant salaries.

Leonard, Cynthia v City of Waterbury
1630341 (appeal pending)
Mount, 10/03/2019

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent did not interview her for, or promote her to, the position of human resources assistant because of her physical disability. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent's articulated reason was a pretext for discrimination. She met all the requirements of the first job posting and had been performing the job for which she had applied. The respondent's revision to the original job posting was arbitrarily and discriminatorily motivated. The complainant was awarded $118,353.06 in backpay, $35,000 in emotional distress damages, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Leslie, Willie v. City of New Haven
9830575
Allen, 9/1/99

Hearing in damages. Held*:* (1) Request to suspend hearing denied as being unreasonable after five prior continuances; and (2) the complainant and the commission's failure to appear and produce evidence of damages and prospective relief required results in dismissal.

Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark
9810387
Knishkowy, 9/1/99

Motion to dismiss as to one of 3 respondents denied. Motion did not include affidavits or other supporting documents other than excerpts from investigator's reasonable cause finding. Held*:* (1) Although commission investigator had found no reasonable cause as to him, the entire complaint was certified for public hearing; therefore, the Referee cannot rely upon the investigator's findings as a basis for dismissing the case. Once a complaint is

certified for public hearing, the Referee must conduct *de novo* proceeding on the merits; and (2) If evidence exists to exonerate him, it must be presented at the public hearing.

Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark
9810387
Knishkowy, 8/2/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant, who suffered from Parkinson's disease, brought action under state and federal fair housing statutes alleging that the respondents, teenage boys in the neighborhood, discriminated against him because of his disabilities. Held*:* The complainant proved that the respondents harassed him because of his disability and created a hostile housing environment. The respondents were found liable for property damage, costs, attorneys fees, and emotional distress.

Lohr, Grace v Greenwich Bd of Education
1220147
Mount, 08/02/2018

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for its decision to terminate the complainant's employment.

Lorimer, Valerie v Southern CT State Univ
1230447
Mount, 05/07/2015

Motion to strike. *Held*: motion denied. The complainant pleaded sufficient facts to sustain her claim. Whether an entity is a place of public accommodation is a fact specific inquiry.

Lopes, Elizabeth v. Comfort Suites
0540252
Austin, 10/25/05

Hearing in damages. After having been sexually harassed by a co-worker, the complainant complained to her supervisor who took no remedial action. The complainant again complaint to her supervisor after a third instance of being sexually harassed by the same co-worker. The supervisor's response was "we are all family, enjoy it and I don't want to hear it." The following day the complainant was terminated. Discrimination was found for having previously opposed a discriminatory practice. The complainant was awarded back pay of $23,225.50 with postjudgment interest, reinstatement to the position she held at the time of termination, and front pay until such time as the complainant is reinstatement or rejects an offer of reinstatement.

Lopez, Patricia v Subway Stratford LLC
1120261
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $44,033 in back pay, $3000 in attorney's fees, $500 in emotional distress damages and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to reimburse the state $18,179 in unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Magda, Muriel v. Diageo North America
0420213
Knishkowy, 3/16/06

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent moved to dismiss two lesser allegations which the investigator had found to be untimely filed. The motion was unaccompanied by the investigator's report or any other pertinent documentation. The motion was denied because (1) the investigator certified the entire complaint—and not merely portions thereof--to public hearing, so the timeliness challenges will need to be addressed de novo at hearing; (2) the challenged allegations may be a part of a "continuing violation" and the complainant should have the opportunity to adduce evidence on this matter.

Maher, Stacy v. New Britain Transportation Co.
0330303
Kerr, 04/17/06

Final decision. Case dismissed. The complainant claimed discrimination as a result of her gender in her rate of pay, being passed over for promotion, being offered a promotion on lesser terms than males, having her hours reduced and being constructively discharged. The complaint was brought under CFEPA, Title Vll and the Equal Pay Act. After full hearing the complaint was dismissed for failure to establish a prima facie case as some allegations did not constitute adverse employment actions and others were under circumstances where no improper animus could be inferred.

Maier, Martin H. v. City of Norwalk
9320024
Maier, Martin H. v. Norwalk Municipal Employees Assoc.
9320026
FitzGerald, 9/29/99

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. The complainant failed to prove *prima facie* case and intentional age discrimination.

Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 7/23/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) Corporate officer/shareholder/director who performs traditional employee duties on a full-time basis is counted as an "employee" to meet the three-employee requirement of General Statutes §46a-51(10). (2) Corporate officers cannot claim to be de facto partners in order to avoid their responsibilities under the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 12/16/99

Ruling on Interrogatories. Held*:* Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 6/30/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant proved that her supervisor, the respondent's president, sexually harassed her and created a hostile work environment, with strict liability imputed to the respondent. The complainant was terminated from her job shortly after she complained to her supervisor about the harassment. She proved that her termination was in retaliation for opposing his behavior and demonstrated that the respondent's proffered reason—poor attitude and work performance—was a pretext and was the direct result of the supervisor's conduct. The complainant awarded backpay, prejudgment interest, costs of insurance coverage.

Massa, Berzeda v. Electric Boat Corporation
9840265
Manzione, 3/6/00

Motion in limine. Held*:* Once a complaint is certified to public hearing, it is viewed as a whole. Therefore, all allegations within it are the subject of the public hearing regardless of whether reasonable cause was found or conciliation attempted and failed with respect to each allegation within the complaint. (Note: A copy of the ruling is available by contacting the Office of Public Hearings.)

Masterson, Maria v Polish American Citizen's Club
1030184
Mount, 10/31/2014

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. Complainant awarded $7,261 and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation
9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Manzione, 4/19/01

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The complainant proved a prima facie case that his failure to be promoted was discriminatorily based on his race and national origin (Sri Lankan). The respondent articulated two legitimate business reasons: not possessing the required Professional Engineers license and not being the candidate chosen by the interview panel. The complainant proved that these reasons were pretextual by showing that similarly situated white employees were treated differently. The complainant failed, however, to meet his burden of proving that the respondent did not promote him in retaliation for filing a prior CHRO complaint or serving as chair of the internal affirmative action advisory committee. The respondent must pay $9,268.12 as compensation for back pay plus 10% compounded interest; promote the complainant to the next open appropriate position; pay the complainant as front pay an adjustment between his current salary and what he would have been earning had he been promoted, until he is promoted or retires, whichever comes first; credit the complainant with any vacation, personal or other days used for the hearing; and not engage in any retaliatory conduct as a result of these proceedings.

Matson, Joel v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addictions Services
9930311
Wilkerson, 03/25/04

Motion for sanctions granted in part, denied in part. The commission requested sanctions imposed on the respondent for failure to comply with the referee's ruling on a motion to compel which ordered the respondent to produce certain production requests during document discovery. The respondent did not respond to the motion for sanctions within the allotted fourteen days per Connecticut Rules of Practice nor did the respondent ever provide pertinent law to support its position not to comply with the order to produce the requested documents. The referee imposed sanctions on the respondent in that an order was entered finding: that the complainant was treated differently (less favorably) than similarly situated employees not in the complainant's protected class; that similarly situated employees not in the complainant's protected class were never placed on administrative leave for having filed work place violation reports; and that respondent is excluded from introducing into evidence documents or testimony regarding the complainant's alleged symptoms or patterns of retaliation and recrimination used as a defense.

Mayo, Alfred Parker v Bauer, Inc.
0831066
Wilson, 3/25/2013

Motion to dismiss granted. At the conclusion of the complainant's case, the respondent moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to establish a prima facie case. Motion granted pursuant to section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies because the complainant failed to present evidence of a discriminatory motive in the respondent's decision to terminate his employment and failed to produce evidence that he was qualified for the position.

McDonald, Robert v. Waterbury Republican
0630389
(on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 6/12/08

Motion to dismiss granted. The respondent newspaper refused to publish an unpaid announcement (with photograph) of the complainant's same sex civil union with those of marriages similarly submitted. The complainant alleged a denial of a public accommodation under General Statutes § 46a-64 on the basis of sexual orientation and marital status. The respondent claimed First Amendment protection in the exercise of its editorial discretion. Held*:* while there have been legally recognized encroachments on a newspaper's First Amendment rights so as to advance other competing governmental and public interests, such encroachments have not been found in Connecticut (or elsewhere) to extend to the content of unpaid public/personal announcements in a newspaper under the theory that it is a public accommodation. Without a basis for determining that the respondent was a public accommodation for these purposes, the complainant was found to have failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom
0750080
Wilkerson, 09/21/07

Motion to dismiss granted in part; denied in part. Held*:* the complainant has standing to bring a housing discrimination complaint against her neighbors alleging a hostile housing environment in which the respondents harassed and intimidated her and her family because of the complainant's race and ancestry. The complainant stated a claim for which relief can be granted as the only party complainant to this complaint. The complainant stated a cause of action under General Statutes § 46a-64c (a) (9), Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. § 3617); and 42 U.S.C. § 1982 for a violation of her rights to use and enjoy her property. The complainant did not state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 because she did not allege that a contractual relationship existed between her and the respondents, which the respondents interfered with or prevented because of her race.

McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v Donna & David Vahlstrom
0750080
FitzGerald, 03/19/08

Motion to reopen public hearing denied. The public hearing was held on February 20, 2008 and February 26, 2008. The respondents, represented by counsel, did not testify at the public hearing because, although they were listed on the commission's proposed witness list, the commission chose not to call them and because they were not listed on their own witness list. On March 4, 2008, the respondents moved to re-open the hearing to permit them to testify. Held*:* General Statute § 4-177c and §§ 46a-54-78a and 46a-54-90a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies provide that a party's participation in a contested case is a reasonable opportunity subject to oversight by the presiding referee, not an unrestricted right. The hearing conference summary and order of May 1, 2007 placed all parties on clear and unequivocal notice that they were to file and serve a list of the party's proposed witnesses and that witnesses not listed, except for impeachment and rebuttal, may not be permitted to testify except for good cause shown. The respondents filed a witness list but did not list themselves as witnesses and failed to file a motion to amend their list to include themselves. The requirement that all potential witnesses, including parties, be identified on the proffering party's witness list is not unreasonable and the respondents did not show that good cause existed for their failures to include themselves on their witness list.

McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom
0750080
FitzGerald, 06/06/08

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that the respondents, her neighbors, discriminated against her on the basis of her color and ancestry and created a hostile housing environment in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1982, Title VIII and General Statutes SS 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64c (a) (9). Held: (1) the respondents did not violate 42 U.S.C. § 1982, Title VIII or § 46a-58 (a) because they did not engage in violence or threaten violence; (2) § 46a-64c (9) prohibits discriminatory interference with any person in the person's post-acquisition exercise or enjoyment of his or her property. Prohibited interference includes severe, pervasive and grossly offensive nonviolent conduct directed against a person because of his or her protected status; (3) members of a household have a cause of action for actual interference in their own exercise and enjoyment of their property against a neighbor for the neighbor's severe, pervasive and grossly offensive nonviolent conduct toward any member of the household because of the member's protected status; and (4) the commission failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents' conduct toward the complainant and her sons was (a) because of the complainant's race or ancestry and (b) sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the complainant's living conditions and to create a hostile housing environment for the complainant.

McKinney, Kirk v Town of Glastonbury Fire Dept.
1140156
Wilson, 01/16/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated General Statutes section 46a-60(a)(1), 46a-64(a)(1), 46a-74 and 46a-76 when it refused him to retain his position as deputy chief because he had turned 66 years old. *Held*: General Statute Section 46a-60(b)(1)(C) creates a statutory exclusion from the age discrimination protections found in section 46a-60(a) for firefighters. Further, that prohibitions against discrimination in access to and enjoyment of public accommodations, pursuant to section 46a-64 to not extend to employment by any enterprise defined, pursuant to section 46a-63(1) to be a place of public accommodation. Employment discrimination by places of public accommodation, resort or amusement are regulated by sections 46a-58m 46a-60 and 46a-81c.

McNeal-Morris, Malisa v. Czeslaw Gnat
9950108
Knishkowy, 1/4/00

Hearing in damages. After the complainant negotiated purchase of residential property from the respondent landowner, the respondent changed his mind several times, resulting in a series of postponements for the closing. More than two months after the original closing date, the respondent decided he would not sell to complainant at all. The respondent's liability established by order of default. After hearing in damages, complainant awarded: (1) economic damages for various expenses needlessly incurred in preparation for the closing and move ($3,995), and (2) emotional distress damages ($6,500).

McWeeny, Robert v. City of Hartford
0410314
(appeal dismissed)
FitzGerald, 08/02/05

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The respondents paid a pension to the complainant's spouse, a retired city employee. When the complainant's spouse died, the respondents paid a spousal allowance to the complainant, who had never been employed by the respondents. The respondents terminated the spousal allowance upon the complainant's remarriage. The complainant alleged that the termination of the allowance constituted discrimination against him on the basis of his marital status. There was no evidence that the respondents had discriminated against the employed spouse. Held: (1) employee status is a prerequisite to maintaining a complaint of employment discrimination and (2) complaint dismissed because the complainant never had employee status with any of the respondents.

Mejias, David v. Mortgage Company of America
0630076
Knishkowy, 3/22/07

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent deemed liable for national origin discrimination for its treatment (i.e., "terms and conditions of employment") and ultimate constructive discharge of the complainant. Pursuant to §46a-86(b), the referee awarded the complainant $43,214 for back pay and unpaid commissions, along with compounded pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

Melvin, Roderick v. Yale University
0230320
Trojanowski, 07/17/2006

Amended final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in the terms and conditions of his employment; given warnings, poor evaluations and unfairly disciplined; received unequal pay; retaliated against; not promoted; and terminated because of his having filed a complaint with the commission, and his race, color, and perceived disability. Held: The complainant was unable to show that the respondent's explanation for its actions (the complainant's history of poor work performance) was a pretext for its actions. The complainant was also unable to show that any harassment was so severe or pervasive as to create a hostile work environment.

Miranda, Andrew v New Haven Bd of Educ
1030148
Mount, 10/20/2016

Final decision. Judgement for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent illegally discriminated against him when it unilaterally withdrew him from school. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent's articulated business reason for withdrawing him from school was not credible and was instead a pretext for discrimination. The complainant was awarded $25,000 in emotional distress damages.

Milton, Michele v. Pulte Homes, Inc.
0630188
(appeal withdrawn)
FitzGerald, 12/03/09

Final decision. The complainant alleged that the respondent, her former employer, violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) and Title VII when she was harassed, received unequal pay and was subsequently terminated because of her age and sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that that the complainant was harassed or terminated because of her sex or her age. The commission, though, did establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the complainant received less compensation than similarly situated non-basis sales managers because of her sex and/or age and relief awarded.

Mohammed, Saeed v Norwalk Economic Opportunity Now Inc
1420210
Mount, 09/15/2014

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay of $721, pre-judgment interest of $72.30 per week, emotional distress damages of $1,000 and post-judgment interest.

Moore, John v. Dept. of Children & Families
07310209
Levine, 10/20/2009

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) General Statute 46a-58 (a) converts a violation of federal anti-discrimination laws into a violation of Connecticut anti-discrimination laws. The timing requirement for filing a complaint is that under state law. (2) It is premature to grant a motion to dismiss, given the generalized claims of sexual discrimination. (3) The issue is whether the complainant is entitled to offer evidence in support of his claim. (4) At this stage in the administrative proceedings, it is not possible to accurately assess the validity of the respondent's claims that there is no jurisdiction over the original complaint or the amendments. (5) The complainant's claims allege employment discrimination, not workplace violence, and there is no pre-emption of jurisdiction.

Morales, Lourdes v Trinity College
1110162
Mount, 02/04/2013

Ruling on the respondent's motion to dismiss. Motion granted in part and denied in part. Motion granted as to the complainant's claims regarding her suspension as they are time barred. Motion denied as to the remaining claims.

Morales-Martinez, Robinson v Smart Home Preservation
1730254
Wright, 08/14/2019

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $25,572 in backpay, $45,000 in emotional distress damages, and pre- and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $13,312 in reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Navarro, Edwin v. Hospital For Special Care
9710678
Allen, 3/14/03

Final decision. The complainant alleged wrongful termination based on race, color, and gender, and discrimination based on disability alleged to be ADHD and learning disability; HELD: 1. Insufficient evidence presented to establish even prima facie case based on race, color or gender; 2. the complainant failed to show he was disabled according to law and thus prima facie case not established; 3. alternatively, even assuming a prima facie case, the weight of evidence established that discharge was based on legitimate performance grounds and were not based on disability notwithstanding some credibility problems with the respondent's testimony; 4. the complainant did not properly allege a failure to accommodate claim which was asserted in its brief and in any event there was no evidence to support such a claim.

Negron, Lishka v. DSMA Enterprises
0110448
FitzGerald, 4/11/03

The respondent’s motion to dismiss the complainant because of the complainant’s failure to appear at a hearing conference was granted. Section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies and case law authorize the presiding referee to dismiss a complaint for the complainant’s failure to attend a hearing or conference without just cause. Neither the commission nor the complainant offered any reason for the complainant’s absence. The attendance of counsel for the commission is not an adequate substitute for the presence of the complainant, who is an independent party not represented by the commission.

Nemeth, Sandor v Wesport Big & Tall, Inc
0920337
(remand by agreement)
FitzGerald, 7/23/10

The presiding referee dismissed the complaint sua sponte for the complainant’s failure to appear. Neither the complainant nor his attorney attended the hearing conference.

Nicolosi, Patricia v. Johnny’s Pizza
9840466
Giliberto, 10/26/99

Order of dismissal due to the complainant’s failure to cooperate. Pro se complainant failed to attend scheduling conference and settlement conference without excuse or explanation.

Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co.
0120389
Knishkowy, 1/17/03

Motion to dismiss/motion for summary judgment denied. Motion to dismiss may be viewed as motion for summary judgment when the issue is one of facts, not of jurisdiction. In motion for summary judgment, the tribunal's role is not to resolve issues of fact, but to determine if any issue of material fact exists.The movant bears the burden of demonstrating there is no genuine issue of material fact. Based on conflicting affidavits from two physicians, whether complainant's sinusitis and rhinitis were chronic impairments under state law is a question of fact to be decided by the referee. Additionally, the respondent's allegation that it had no notice of complainant's need for accommodation was amply contradicted by the complainant's affidavit; thus, this is also a factual matter requiring full adjudication.

Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co.
0120389
Knishkowy, 2/6/04

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held: The complainant, a certified public accountant, failed to prove 4th prong of prima facie case in his state law complaint alleging termination because of his disability, sinusitis. Even if he had proven his prima facie case, he could not meet his ultimate burden of proving that his termination was motivated by a discriminatory animus. The complainant also failed to satisfy the prima facie case for his "failure to accommodate" state law claim because he did not need an accommodation in order to perform the essential functions of his job. The complainant finally failed to prove that his termination and other adverse employment actions constituted unlawful retaliation in violation of state antidiscrimination law.

Ocana, Holger v. Metro-North Railroad Co.
0630645
(appeal dismissed)
FitzGerald, 10/16/08

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) and also Title VII and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act when it failed to promote him because of his age and national origin. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss claiming that the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The respondent argued that it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, organized under the laws of the State of New York. As a result of a compact between Connecticut and New York, codified in General Statutes §§ 16-343 and 16-344, the respondent operates a commuter rail service in Connecticut and is exempted by Connecticut's legislature from state regulation, including exemption from Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws.

Held: the respondent is in the business of providing mass transportation and railroad service pursuant to the Connecticut – New York compact and is the beneficiary of the exemption in § 16-344 (a). Its promotion of employees involved in its mass transportation

and railroad service is within its routine and normal business operations. Based on the Connecticut Supreme Court's decision in *Greenwich v Connecticut Transportation Authority*, 166 Conn. 337(1974), the exemption in § 16-344 (a) applies to this case. Therefore, the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction of this claim and the motion to dismiss is granted.

Okonkwo, Francis v. Bidwell Healthcare Center
9940144
FitzGerald, 2/5/01

Motion to dismiss denied in part, granted in part. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction based on reasonable cause findings. The respondent claimed that the investigator (1) found no reasonable cause to believe that the complainant had been sexually harassed; and (2) improperly found reasonable cause for an allegation, disparate treatment, not alleged in the complaint. Held*:* (1) motion granted as to the sexual harassment claim because the investigator concluded that the investigation did not support the complainant's allegations of sexual harassment; and (2) denied as to the disparate treatment claim because the complaint alleged sufficient facts to put the respondent on notice that the allegation would reasonably fall within the scope of the investigation.

O'Halloran, Josephine v. Town of Fairfield
0620146
(appeal dismissed)
Austin, 5/20/08

Final Decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that she was denied a promotion for the position of zoning inspector as a consequence of her gender. She further alleged that the respondent failed to follow the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Held: The complainant failed to present a prima facie case in that she failed to satisfy the element that she was qualified for the position. Further, even if the complainant had sustained her burden of being qualified, she was not the best candidate in the field of three females and one male. As to the complainant's claims that the CBA was not followed, no credible evidence was submitted to believe that the respondent used the complainant's gender in determining how to interpret the CBA.

O'Neill, Eileen v. J.P. Dempsey's, Inc.
9430534
Knishkowy, 6/11/99

Ruling on Interrogatories. Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery limited by Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Onoh, Mystraine v. Sterling, Inc.
9620499
Manzione, 6/22/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* (1) Construing the facts in a light most favorable to the non-moving party, facts are in dispute, therefore, case is not ripe for a Motion to Dismiss; (2) human rights referees have the authority to dismiss a complaint even absent a full evidentiary hearing on the merits.

Pappy, John v. Southern Connecticut State University
0730288
FitzGerald, 06/28/10

Motion to compel denied. The respondent sought all medical records from 1997 to date because the complainant claims damages for emotional distress. The respondent also sought personnel records from the complainant's employers prior to the respondent hiring the complainant in 1989. Ruling: (1) the medical records are exempt from disclosure because the complainant is alleging "garden variety" emotional distress, and psychological and mental conditions are not elements in a claim for garden variety emotional distress and (2) employment records from over twenty years ago are not relevant and material to the employment conditions alleged by the complainant or to the defenses raised by the respondent in its answer.

Pappy, John v. Southern Connecticut State University
0730288
FitzGerald, 10/12/10

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and §§ 46a-58 (a) (1) and (4), and 46a-60 (a) and 46a-70 (a) and (e). Motion granted as to the § 46a-58 (a) retaliation claim; motion denied as to the § 46a-58 (a) race and national origin claims. Motion denied, without prejudice, as to the claim of untimeliness.

Parker-Bair, Florence v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles
0510486
Austin , 12/15/09

Motion to dismiss granted. Held: The respondent moved to dismiss complaint's allegations of retaliation for having previously opposed discrimination due to the lack of jurisdiction. The basis for respondent's motion was that the commission's investigator did not find reasonable cause as to the claim of retaliation. Not only was there no reasonable cause found, the investigator opined that filing with the commission resulted in the complainant's promotion. There being no reasonable cause found to believe that retaliation may have occurred deprives this tribunal of jurisdiction to hear this claim.

Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services
0220394
FitzGerald, 6/8/04

Motion in limine denied for failure to explain its legal position and to provide supporting documentation and affidavits.

Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services
0220394
FitzGerald, 7/6/06

Motion to dismiss, instead treated where appropriate as a motion for summary judgment and a motion to strike, Granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against him on the basis of religion. The complainant did not establish an adverse employment action or that similarly situated co-workers were being treated differently. The complainant's proposed relief would have required the respondent to violate the Establishment Clauses of the federal and state constitutions.

Perreira, Bhagmattie v Yale New Haven Hospital
1430048
Mount, 09/07/2016

Motion for summary judgement. Motion granted. Two years prior to filing this complaint against Yale New Haven Hospital (YNHH), the complainant has filed a complaint against the Hospital of Saint Raphael (HSR). The complaint filed against YNHH, successor in interest to HSR. The complaint again YNHH is nearly identical to the earlier one filed against HSR. Subsequent to filing the complaint against YNHH, the complainant signed a release and settlement agreement in her case against HSR. *Held*: motion granted. The principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel apply. If the complainant were to go forward and be successful in this complaint, she would be recovering for an alleged injury for which she has already been compensated.

Perri, Dennis v George Peluso
0750113
Austin, 6/13/08

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent alleged that because the complaint that was filed beyond the 180-day filing requirement, it was untimely filed and the commission subject matter jurisdiction. Held: the 180-day filing requirement does not confer subject matter jurisdiction but is more similarly related to a statute of limitation subject to equitable tolling. Based on the actions taken by the CHRO investigator, the filing by the complainant Sonia Perri was subject to equitable tolling.

Perry, Claude v. Town of Ansonia
9730481
Knishkowy, 12/20/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* Although the commission investigator found reasonable cause on one allegation in the complaint, and no reasonable cause on the other three allegations, the *entire complaint* was certified for public hearing in accordance with the plain and unambiguous language of § 46a-84. Once a complaint is certified, the Referee must conduct a de novo hearing on the entire complaint and not rely upon the investigator's report as a basis for dismissal.

Perry, Corrine v Dept. of Public Safety
0830218
Bromley, 01/10/2014

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that the respondent failed to select her as a trooper training because of her age. Held: the complainant failed to establish that the background investigator harbored and acted with discriminatory animus.

Perry, Richard v. Hamilton Sundstrand
9710063
FitzGerald, 01/04/02

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) whether the complainant applied for a position is a question of fact; (2) the public hearing is not an opportunity to challenge the adequacy of precertification investigation; (3) commission has jurisdiction to adjudicate ADEA claims; (4) failure of investigator to comply with "date certain" for issuance of reasonable cause finding pursuant to General Statutes § 46a-82 does not result in the dismissal of the complaint; (5) complaint is not necessarily preempted by Labor Management Act.

Peters, Wendy Ann v Polish American Citizen's Club
1220183
Mount, 12/08/2014

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear. The respondent was ordered to pay the complainant $2,752 in backpay and pre- and post judgement interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $1518 in reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Peterson, Dana v. City of Hartford, Police Dept.
0410049
Austin, 11/14/08

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged she was discriminated against as a consequence of her gender and disabilities (transsexual/physical and mental/gender dysphoria disorder). She further alleged that as a consequence of her having previously opposed an alleged discriminatory employment practice she was retaliated against by the respondent. Held: The complainant and commission failed to establish a prima facie case under the pretext model of analysis on most of the complainant's claims. As to the claims where the complainant successfully presented a prima facie case the legitimate business reason produced by the respondent for its decision was not proven to be a pretext for discrimination.

Phan, Khoa v Hartford Police
1210181 (appeal pending)
Mount, 03/04/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent illegally discriminated against him when it terminated him from his position as a probationary police office because of his ancestry. The complainant was awarded $210,596 in backpay; $25,000 in emotional distress damages; and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection
9910114
FitzGerald, 2/1/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated at the end of his probationary period because of his national origin, color, and ancestry. Held*:* (1) the complainant offered no direct evidence of discriminatory motivation; (2) the complainant also did not show, under the McDonnell Douglas-Burdine analysis that he was qualified for the position, circumstances giving rise to an inference of discrimination, or that the respondent's articulated legitimate business reason was a pretext for discrimination or otherwise lacking in credibility.

Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard
0550113
Kerr, 5/3/07

Final decision. The complainant alleged that she was discriminated against in being denied rental housing on the basis of her section 8 source of income, in violation of General Statutes § 46a-64c (a) (1). The respondent alleged that the denial was based on unsatisfactory credit and failing to comply with her last minute demand that the complainant provide proof of good funds for first month's rent and security two days prior to the lease inception. It was found that there was evidence of the respondent having stated that the cause of the rejection was

her husband's refusal to accept the governmental involvement (in the form of section 8 paperwork and including submission of IRS form W-9) section 8 participation requires. This conclusion was supported by several exhibits (some executed by both parties), which confirmed a meeting of the minds on all rental details. The *Price Waterhouse* model was applied and it was found that the respondent did not meet her burden of establishing that she would have denied the complainant rental housing even in the absence of the complainant's section 8 source of income. The complainant was awarded $5,000 for emotional distress and an attorney's fee award was made in the amount of $10,500.

Planas, Felix v Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis
1210127
Bromley, 05/21/2014

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant in part and for the respondent in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent (1) discriminated against him by failing to engage in an interactive process to accommodate his physical disability; (2) discriminated against him and terminated his employment because of his disability; and (3) terminated his employment in retaliation for requesting reasonable accommodations and rejecting a non-equivalent job offer. *Held*: judgment entered in favor of the complainant on the claim that the respondent failed to reasonably accommodate his disability. The complainant demonstrated that the respondent failed to engage in the interactive process and denied him reasonable accommodations on the basis of his disability. Judgment in favor of the respondent on the discrimination and retaliation claims. The respondent was ordered to hire the complainant for the next available principal analyst or equivalent position; pay the complainant backpay in the amount of $177,958.11; pay the state $19,950 as reimbursement for unemployment compensation benefits paid to the complainant; pay the complainant pre- and post-judgment interest; and reimburse the complainant $17,508.60 in medical expenses.

Pullicino, Laura v Pelham Sloane, Inc.
0920214
Bromley, 10/10/2012

Hearing in damages. Responded defaulted for failure to appear and for failure to file and answer. The complainant alleged that she was terminated from her employment because of her disability. The complainant awarded $76,793 in backpay, unreimbursed medical expenses and pre- and post-judgment interest. Respondent further order to pay $44,729 to the state representing unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Punzalan, Roxanne v Zheng Trust LLC dba Koto Japanese Restaurant
1140112
Mount, 10/28/2014

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay in the amount of $9,861.50; emotional distress damages of $7,500; attorney fees in the amount of $8,150, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Puryear, Brenda v Echo Hose Ambulance and the City of Shelton
1130518
Bromley, 01/10/2013

Motion to strike. Complainant alleged that the respondents discriminated against her on the basis of her race and color. *Held*: motion granted. There was no employment relationship as the complainant was a volunteer, not an employee.

Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc.
0440130
(stipulated agreement on appeal)
FitzGerald, 11/28/05

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged he was terminated because of his age. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear at the hearing conference and for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded back pay of $35,535.99 and additional relief.

Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc.
0440130
(stipulated agreement on appeal)
FitzGerald, 12/30/05

Motions to stay, to reconsider back pay calculation and to reopen default judgment were denied. Back pay was properly calculated from date of discriminatory termination to date of judgment, less mitigation. The length of the complainant's employment with the respondent and his separation from subsequent employment do not preclude the accrual of back pay. The respondent failed to show mistake, accident or other reasonable cause to justify setting aside the default judgment.

Rajtar, *Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield*
0510115
Kerr, 10/03/07

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: An arbitration panel's finding that the complainant (a police officer) had been untruthful during an investigation and subsequent disciplinary action, and a subsequent superior court ruling that the complainant could not be returned to duty by the panel as a matter of public policy, did not preclude the commission from considering whether the complainant's termination was an impermissible discriminatory act. The decision

reasoned that discriminatory animus had not been considered by the town, panel or court, and that the complainant should be afforded the opportunity to establish that the finding of untruthfulness was pretext for a termination impermissibly predicated on the basis of his age. This case was distinguishable from *Sperow v. Regional School District No. 7,* CHRO No. 0130607).

Rajtar, Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield
0510115
(appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 10/03/07

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that he had been wrongfully terminated as a police officer by the respondent on the basis of age. The respondent's decision to terminate had been set aside by an arbitration panel, which had found the complainant had been untruthful during an investigation and subsequent disciplinary hearing but had reduced the termination to a 200 workday suspension. The complainant maintained that the charges against him, the disciplinary proceedings and his discharge were pretext for age discrimination. There was evidence of tolerated and department wide disparagement of older patrol officers, of disparate discipline predicated on age, and of an investigation of the complainant's alleged dishonesty so one sided and perfunctory as to lend substantial credence to the complainant's assertion that the disciplinary process, finding of dishonesty and resultant termination were but pretext for a wrongful termination predicated on age. The complainant was awarded $80,369.34 for back pay, accrued time in the amount of 687.97 hours, $19,792 for medical expenses incurred as a result of loss of insurance, prejudgment interest from January 9, 2006, post judgment interest and other equitable relief.

Rajtar, Donald J. v Town of Bloomfield
0510115
(appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 11/08/07

The respondent, the complainant and the commission filed petitions to reconsider. The respondent's petition to reconsider the earlier denial of its motion to dismiss was denied. The complainant's and the respondent's petitions to reconsider the final decision was granted. Held: The final decision was affirmed and clarified to provide that the complainant be reinstated to full duty as a Bloomfield officer and that the final decision be implemented independent of any disposition in *Town of Bloomfield v. United Electrical Radio & Machine Workers of America*, 2006 WL 3491719 (Conn. Super.) because that matter is proceeding on a finding that the complainant (Rajtar) had been untruthful, which finding was rejected in the final decision as pretext advanced to impermissibly justify a termination effectuated because of age discrimination.

Ramirez, Ezequiel v Smart Home Preservation
1730247
Wright, 08/14/2019

Hearing in damages. *Held*: Complaint dismissed for failure to comply with all requisite procedural notices and jurisdictional requirements.

Ratner, Ira v. Home & Life Security, Inc.
9930246
Manzione, 5/12/00

Motion to dismiss granted due to failure to cooperate. The complainant, who was represented by counsel, failed to comply with multiple orders. The complainant, himself, failed to attend a settlement conference without excuse or permission. The complainant also failed to file and serve a settlement conference report, failed to produce documents in compliance with a ruling on a motion to compel, filed to file and serve exhibit and witness lists, failed to bring exhibits to the prehearing conference and failed to return opposing counsel's telephone calls. Held*:* the human rights referee has authority to dismiss complaints pursuant to § 46a-54-101 of the Regulations. Also, the nature of the relationship between the attorney and his client is one of traditional agency. The acts of an attorney are ordinarily attributed to his client. Therefore, the severe inaction of the complainant or his attorney warrants dismissal of the complaint.

Recupero, Guy v. L.G. Defelice, Inc.
0530022
Kerr, 4/10/08

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon unlawful dismissal based upon mental disability (bipolar disorder). After hearing held damages awarded under CFEPA in the amount of $164,059.93, plus prejudgment interest, post judgment interest and $12,703 in reimbursement of unemployment compensation payments received. Request for front pay award denied.

Rhodes, Kevin v. Mortgage Company of America
0630040
Knishkowy, 3/15/07

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent liable for race discrimination for its treatment (i.e., "terms and conditions of employment") and ultimate termination of the complainant. Pursuant to §46a-86(b) the referee awarded the complainant $33,960 for back pay and unpaid commissions, along with compounded pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge
0640147
Wilkerson Brillant, 12/29/08

Motion to amend the complaint to add a respondent: denied without prejudice: Held: The named respondent, Germania Lodge, the employer, is separate and distinct from Germania Lodge, the membership organization that is a subordinate of the Order of Hermann's Sons. The complainant did not establish that the entity to be added as a respondent, Order of Hermann's Sons, met the criteria of the identity or instrumentality rules in order to pierce the corporate veil. There was no evidence that the Order of Hermann's Sons had control over the employer, Germania Lodge's finances and employment policies and/or business practices. Also, there was no evidence that there existed a unity of interest and ownership for the Order of Hermann's Sons and Germania Lodge as an employer. The evidence showed that as an employer, Germania Lodge is an independent entity with separate funds and policies to conduct its employment operations.

Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge
0640147
Wilkerson Brillant, 03/03/09

Motion to amend granted; allegation of retaliation dismissed. The complainant alleged in her original complaint that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-60 (a) (1) and 46a-58 (a) when it discriminated against her because of her sex when it terminated her employment and denied her membership in its social club. She also alleged the respondent retaliated against her by terminating her because she applied for membership in its social club. The complainant requested that her complaint be amended to add violations of §§ 46a-63 and 46a-64 (a) (public accommodation and she also identified that the respondent as Germania Lodge. The respondent argued that the public accommodation claim had not been fully investigated prior to certification of the complaint and therefore its due process rights would be violated if the amendment were granted. The complaint had originally been dismissed by the investigator's finding of no reasonable cause which did include limited findings on the public accommodation issue. The complainant's reconsideration request was granted and the executive director's decision on reconsideration directed further investigations on the public accommodation claim. Subsequently, the investigator issued a finding of reasonable cause on the complainant's termination, public accommodation and retaliation claims.

Held*:* Because the claim of public accommodation discrimination was alleged in the original complaint and had been investigated and because there was, after reconsideration, a finding of reasonable cause on the entire complaint, the respondent was fully aware of the public accommodation discrimination claim. More importantly, the public hearing process is not to be used as an appeal of the investigator's processing of the complaint pursuant to Section 46a-84 (b). Therefore, the motion to amend is granted allowing the public accommodation claim. However, the complainant's retaliation claim is dismissed because her allegation that the respondent retaliated against her because she

applied for membership in the respondent's social club is not protected activity pursuant to § 46a-60 (a) (4).

Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge
0640147
Wilkerson Brillant, 07/01/09

Motion for sanctions granted in part; denied in part. The respondent moved for sanctions against the complainant for her failure to produce documents as ordered. The respondent was seeking documents, specifically income tax returns, pertaining to the complainant's damages calculation including her earned income from the respondent's employ and her mitigation obligation. The complainant had provided inconsistent reasons for not providing the documents as ordered. The commission and the complainant were precluded from introducing any evidence related to the complainant's income tax returns or relevant income information.

Robinson, Patricia v. Dept. of Mental Health
0630292
Knishkowy, 3/26/08

Motion to dismiss denied with one exception. (1) the respondent argued this employment discrimination claim was barred by doctrine of sovereign immunity. The respondent relied upon *Lyon v. Jones*, 104 Conn. App. 547 (2007), cert. granted, 285 Conn. 914 (2008) in support of assertion that this tribunal lacks jurisdiction because the complainant did not obtain permission to sue from the state claims commissioner. The respondent erred because General Statutes § 4-142 exempts from the claims commissioner's purview "claims for which an administrative hearing procedure otherwise is established by law." The CHRO administrative process for discrimination claims is precisely the type envisioned here. (2) The respondent also incorrectly claimed that this tribunal has no jurisdiction over federal claims. Case law has clarified that General Statutes § 46a-58 (a) expressly converts a violation of federal antidiscrimination law into a violation of Connecticut antidiscrimination laws. § 46a-58 (a) does not include "age" as one of the listed protected classes, so the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act cannot be raised via 46a-58 (a) and must be dismissed. The complainant's federal race, color, physical disability, and retaliation claims remain viable through 46a-58 (a).

Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center
1330398
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Motion to dismiss as to the University of Connecticut Health Center. *Held*: the motion to dismiss as to the University of Connecticut Health Center (UCHC) granted. The complainant filed his complaint against the Department of Correction on March 25, 2013 and filed an amendment on September 15, 2014 to add the UCHC as a respondent. The amendment

exceeds the 180-day statutory filing period of any alleged discriminatory conduct by UCHC and there is no evidence to support equitable tolling or constructive notice.

Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center
1330398
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Motion to strike as to the Department of Correction. *Held*: motion granted in part and denied in part. Motion granted as to claims under Section 46a-64(a) and 46a-74 as the Department of Correction is not a public accommodation. Motion denied as to claims under Section 46a71 and 46a-77.

Rosado, Nestor v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
0020469
Giliberto, 11/15/00

Hearing in damages. Both the complainant and the respondent failed to appear. The Order of Relief included: (1) a cease-and-desist order against the respondent; and (2) the respondent was ordered to place posters, to be supplied by the commission at all of its Connecticut locations.

Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc.
9920353
FitzGerald, 11/1/99

Hearing in damages. Employee terminated from employment on the basis of national origin and ancestry, and for opposing the respondent's discriminatory employment practice. The complainant awarded front pay, backpay, and other equitable remedies.

Rountree, Maria S. v. Seafood Peddler
9830387
FitzGerald, 5/14/99

Motion to amend the complaint denied. Provides criteria for amending complaints to add complainants/respondents.

Rowe, CarolAnne v Allied World Assurance Company
1810381
FitzGerald, 12/29/2021

The respondent's motion for sanctions for failing to comply with an order to produce documents was granted. Sanctions included exclusion of documents and testimony.

Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba
0450057
Knishkowy, 5/23/06

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant proved that the respondent, a real estate broker, denied her an apartment because of her lawful source of income (Section 8 assistance), in violation of § 46a-64c.

Saex, Randall v. Wireless Retail, Inc.
0410175
FitzGerald, 07/26/2006

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear at a settlement conference. The complainant alleged, in part, that the respondent harassed him and terminated his employment because of his age, religion and sex. The complainant was awarded damages including back pay, front pay, reimbursement of medical expenses, pre- and post-judgment interest, and emotional distress.

Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services
9940089
(appeal withdrawn)
Knishkowy, 8/9/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant suffered from depression and sought, as accommodation, the ability to work at home. When his request was denied, he resigned. In this instance, working at home was not a reasonable accommodation. Furthermore, the respondent did provide other reasonable accommodations to complainant. The complainant also failed to prove constructive discharge because he was unable to prove that the respondent denied him a reasonable accommodation and because he was unable to show that the respondent intentionally created a work environment so intolerable that would force a reasonable person to resign voluntarily.

Samuel, Henrietta Lorraine Stevens v. Pond Point Health Care Center d/b/a Lexington Health Care
0230332
Wilkerson, 9/9/04

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to appear at a hearing conference and failure to file an answer. The respondent had terminated/suspended and harassed the complainant multiple times during her employment with the respondent. Discrimination and retaliation based on race, color (Black) and physical disability (hypertension cardiac). The complainant was awarded $17,788.95 for back pay and $1,778.89 for prejudgment interest and 10% per year for postjudgment interest.

Sanchez, Maria v. Atlantic Communications, Corp.
0430462
Kerr, 03/08/05

Hearing in damages. The complainant filed her affidavit of discriminatory practice on March 12, 2004, alleging sexual harassment and wrongful termination (on the basis of her sex) in violation of General Statutes §§ 46a-58(a) and 46a-60(a)(1) and Title VII. The respondent was defaulted on January 5, 2005 for failure to file an answer and a hearing in damages was held on February 17, 2005. The respondent was ordered to cease and desist in further sexual harassment, to pay the complainant $8,402.70 in back pay, to reimburse the state $3,718 in unemployment compensation benefits paid to the complainant, and to pay pre- and postjudgment interest on both amounts at the rate of 10% per annum.

Saraceno, Cindy v Midstate Medical Center
1130445
Wright, 03/04/2016

Motion to strike. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her when it terminated her employment because of her mental disorder. The respondent moved to strike the complaint on the grounds that the facts as pleaded did not establish that the complainant suffered from a mental disability at the time of her termination and, therefore, fails to state a claim for mental disability discrimination. *Held*: Motion denied. While the complaint may be poorly drafted, the facts as alleged and those that are necessarily employed disclose the bare essentials to state a claim or which relief can be granted and are sufficient to apprise the opposing party of what is meant to be proved.

Sarnecky, Fred v. Hamilton Standard
9910156
Allen, 5/3/00

Ruling on motion to recuse denied. The commission sought to recuse referee because motion to decertify and supporting brief inadvertently sent to Office of Public Hearings. Held*:* Actual bias needed to be shown to recuse hearing officer and no showing was made, particularly where Referee declined to read the briefs in denying the motion to decertify on its face.

Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education
9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Wilkerson, 9/29/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant established prima facie case in failure to promote race, age, and color discrimination case and the respondent's proffered legitimate reasons were false thus pretextual; (2) the complainant teacher applied for the position/promotion of assistant principal and was denied position due to his race, age,

and color; (3) the respondent did not satisfy its burden of proving the complainant failed to mitigate; (4) Award for back pay damages of $56,390.00 plus pre-and post-judgment interest and front pay of $18,796.67 per year until the respondent offers the complainant the next available assistant principal position or until retirement.

Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.
9610577
Giliberto, 9/27/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) General Statutes § 46a-58(a) encompasses ADA claims; (2) Human Rights Referees have authority to adjudicate federal claims, including the ADA; (3) Prior adverse arbitration decision is not entitled to receive substantial weight by this tribunal and does not preclude the complainant from receiving remedies; (4) The complainant's state claims of discrimination are not preempted by § 301 of the Labor-Management Relations Act; (5) The respondent did not regard the complainant as disabled under the ADA; (6) The complainant was not entitled to reasonable accommodations under the ADA based on his "regarded as" claim; (7) General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) includes perceived disability claims; (8) The respondent did not perceive the complainant to be disabled under § 46a-60(a)(1); (9) the *McDonnell Douglas* model of analysis applies to the facts in this matter; and (10) there is no duty to provide reasonable accommodations for perceived disability claims under state law.

Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School
0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)
FitzGerald, 12/02/02

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment, harassed her, and discriminated against her in the terms and conditions of her employment in violation of Title VII and §§ 46a-60(a)(1) and 46a-60(a)(4) in retaliation for her refusal to ask her minister if he was a homosexual. Ruling: the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction because sexual orientation is not an enumerated protected class within Title VII or § 46a-60(a)(1), opposing a discriminatory employment practice is not protected by § 46a-81c, the respondent is exempt under § 46a-81p from § 46a-81c, and/or there is no employment relationship between the respondent and the complainant's minister.

Schopick, Andrew v. Nutmeg Securities, Fieldpoint Private Bank & Trust, M. Rochlin
1123092, 1120439, 1120440
Wilson, 12/08/2015

Age, aid and abet, stray remarks, retaliation

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent in part and for the complainant in part. The complainant alleged that Nutmeg discriminated against him on the basis of his age in terminating his employment and had retaliated against him for his previous opposition to a discriminatory practice. He alleged that Rochlin had also retaliated against him and aided

and abetted Nutmeg Securities in its retaliatory action. He further alleged that Fieldpoint discriminated against him on the basis of his age, aided and abetted in the retaliatory actions taken against him, and was liable for the violations committed by Nutmeg Securities as its successor in interest. *Held*: Age discrimination claim against Nutmeg dismissed because it terminated the complainant's employment because of low production, not because of age discrimination. Nutmeg and Rochlin retaliated against the complainant but no damages were awarded because there was no proof of damages. Complaint against Fieldpoint dismissed because no liability found against Nutmeg as to age discrimination.

Scott, Juliet v. Robert Jemison
9950020
FitzGerald, 3/20/00

Hearing in damages. The complainant's motion for default for failure to file an answer was granted. The respondent's motions to dismiss and set aside default were denied. Case proceeded to a hearing in damages. The complainant was awarded $6,000 for emotional distress and $25,296.44 for attorney's fees and costs. The complainant alleged her landlord physically and verbally assaulted and harassed her, denied her equal services, and threatened her with eviction in violation of General Statutes § 46a-64c(a)(2) and (3) on the basis of her race and color. She also alleged retaliation for the filing of her complaint in violation of § 46a-60(a)(4).

Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority
9710713
Knishkowy, 6/9/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held: (1) Entire complaint, as certified, properly before human rights referee, even though commission investigator found no reasonable cause on several of the allegations. (2) Because the respondent chose not to re-fill vacant foreman position in 1997, the complainant did not prove that the respondent's failure to promote him to foreman was motivated by his physical disabilities. Even if the respondent had filled the position, the complainant was not qualified. (3) The respondent did not harass the complainant because of his disabilities. (4) The respondent did not deny overtime opportunities to the complainant because of his disabilities. (5) The respondent did not unlawfully withhold reasonable accommodations from the complainant. For some time, the complainant was able to perform the essential functions of his job without need for reasonable accommodations. After a work-related injury, there were no reasonable accommodations that would allow the complainant to perform the essential functions. (6) The respondent did not retaliate against the complainant for challenging promotional decisions made in 1995 and 1997.

Senra, Susan v Groton Open MRI LLC
1140018
Mount, 11/14/2014

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that she was illegally terminated due to her gender and pregnancy in violation of General Statutes Sections 45a-60a (1) and (7). *Held*: the complainant established that her pregnancy was a motivating factor in her termination. Complainant awarded backpay of $7,945 and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance
9640243
FitzGerald, 10/26/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant failed to prove that the sexual harassment was sufficiently pervasive or severe to create an abusive work environment and (2) the complainant proved retaliation claim. Although the complainant did not prove sexual harassment claim, she demonstrated good faith belief in the underlying challenged actions. The complainant proved the respondent's business reason was pretextual by showing that the reason was not worthy of credence.

Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk
9720041
(appeal dismissed)
Trojanowski, 6/7/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant is an "individual with a disability" due to his physical impairment of being a wheelchair-bound paraplegic which was found to substantially limit the major life activities of walking and running; (2) The complainant was qualified to perform the essential functions of the job because of his educational background and prior work experience; (3) The complainant requested four reasonable accommodations in order to assist him in performing the essential functions of his job which the respondent never provided; (4) The respondent never introduced any evidence of undue hardship; (5) The complainant's impairment of being a wheelchair-bound paraplegic met both of the definitions of "physically disabled" as well as "reliance on a wheelchair" under state law; and (6) The complainant proved that he was retaliated against through his discharge for exercising his right to request reasonable accommodations under the ADA.

Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley
0840243
Mount, 04/18/2018

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: The complainant signed a valid release waiving

his right to bring this claim. Further, the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Slootskin, Inessa v. John Brown Engineers & Construction, Inc.
9320167
FitzGerald, 4/29/03

Final decision after remand. The final decision was issued by the hearing officer in 1999. On appeal, the matter was remanded as to damages. On remand, the case was reassigned to a human rights referee who awarded front pay, prejudgment and post-judgment interest, and additional back pay and fringe benefits.

Sloss, George T. v. Ed-Mor Electric Company
9930221
Manzione, 6/16/99

Hearing in damages. At a hearing in damages, where no one for the respondent appeared, the complainant was awarded $7,568.00 in back pay, $2,022.00 to reimburse the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation, $2,854.08 to reimburse the complainant's union for other benefits and $46.22/month for prejudgment interest for his claim of discrimination based on age.

Smalls, Kelly v. Waterbury Masonry & Foundation, Inc.
0330386
Trojanowski, 1/23/04

Hearing in damages. Discrimination due to a physical disability, a "drop foot" condition, in violation of General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) as well as the American with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq. Awarded back pay and lost benefits, prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest.

Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions
0130212
FitzGerald, 7/27/01

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged racial discrimination by his employer resulting in disparate treatment, hostile work environment, and constructive discharge. The complainant was awarded $48,496 in back pay and front pay, together with prejudgment and postjudgment compounded interest.

Smith, Eunice v. Dept. of Correction
9710718
Knishkowy, 5/4/00

Parties' third joint motion to extend deadline for legal briefs (on discovery issue) denied after two previous continuances had been granted. Even though parties are engaged in settlement negotiations, they remain obligated to meet previously-established deadlines set by human rights referee. For the same reason, deadline for exchange of witness lists and exhibit lists extended for only 4 business days. Extension of prehearing conference and hearing dates denied.

Sokolowski, Andrea v Trinity Christian School
1230397
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Motion to dismiss. This is the respondent's second motion to dismiss (see Sokolowski v Trinity Christian Church, 1110391, 02/01/2013) in which it again argued that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the ministerial exception under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Held*: motion denied. At this stage of the proceeding, with no evidentiary hearing, the respondent has not established that the complainant's duties are inextricably intertwined with the school's mission.

Soulemani, Arouna v. Mark Ash
0230045
Allen, 01/08/04

Hearing in damages. By virtue of a default for failure to appear, the respondent was held liable for discrimination based on race, color and ancestry against the complainant with regard to the terms and conditions of his employment and for terminating his employment. The complainant was awarded $45,405 as back pay and monetary relief and post judgment interest at the rate of 10% compounded annually. Front pay was not awarded.

Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7
0130607
Kerr, 12/01/05

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. Teacher termination matter based upon sex (female) age and religion (Methodist). Motion predicated on res judicata and collateral estoppel as a result of termination being upheld by impartial state hearing panel (General Statutes 10-151) and superior court on appeal from panel ruling. Motion granted as to claims under General Statutes 46a-60(a)(1) and the ADEA. Motion denied as to claims under General Statutes 46a - 58(a) and Title VII.

Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7
0130607
Kerr, 01/04/06

Motion for reconsideration denied. Held: The request did not meet the statutory standards warranting reconsideration and grossly mischaracterized the final decision by not recognizing that while certain of the complainant's claims were found to be barred by issue preclusion (back pay, reinstatement), others (injunctive relief) were protected by the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the matter could proceed on the limited basis authorized therein.

Standard, Tracy A. v. Esposito Design Associates, Inc.
0820445
FitzGerald, 06/28/10

Objection to defendant corporation proceeding pro se overruled. When the attorney for the respondent corporation withdrew its appearance, the non-lawyer officer of the corporation filed notice that he would be proceeding on behalf of the corporation. The commission's objection to the respondent appearing pro se is overruled as the commission's regulations permit a respondent to appear pro se in an administrative proceeding.

Stevens, Lorraine v. Urban League
0010328
Knishkowy, 12/5/02

Motion to dismiss denied. Motion to dismiss may be treated as a motion to strike, where the respondents challenge not jurisdiction, but the legal sufficiency of claim. The respondents moved to dismiss portion of complaint predicated upon §46a-58(a), asserting that it cannot co-exist with §46a-60(a) employment discrimination claim, pursuant to *CHRO v. Truelove & Maclean, Inc.*, 238 Conn. 337(1996). Notwithstanding the respondents' interpretation of *Truelove*, §46a-58(a) "has expressly converted a violation of federal antidiscrimination laws [here, Title VII] into a violation of Connecticut antidiscrimination laws." (*Trimachi v. Connecticut Workers Comp. Comm*., 2000 WL 872451 (Conn. Super.)) Motion to dismiss §46a-58(a) claim, when treated as a motion to strike, is denied.

Stephenson, Arline v Webster Bank
1110235
Mount, 08/22/2013

Ruling on motion for summary judgment re ADEA: The complainant brought an age discrimination claim under the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) as enforced through General Statute Section 46a-58(a) and under General Statute Sections 46a-60(a)(1) and (4). *Held*: the ADEA claim is dismissed as age is not an enumerated protected class in Section 46a-58(a).

Stephenson, Arline v Webster Bank
1110235
Bromley, 08/22/2013

Ruling on motion for summary judgement re: General Statute 46a-60(a)(1) and (4) claims. *Held*: motion denied as the complainant has shown that there are genuine issues of material facts regarding the role of the complainant's protected class status in determining her priority in the reduction in force and her termination.

Sokolowski, Andrea J.R. v Trinity Christian School
1110391
Bromley, 02/01/2013

Motion to dismiss. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss the complaint. The respondent contends that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the ministerial exception under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Held*: motion denied as the ministerial exception is an affirmative defense rather than a jurisdictional bar.

Staszewski, Mark v Town of Wallingford
1030290
Mount, 02/11/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in the terms and conditions of his employment and retaliated against and that his mental disability/physical disability and previous opposition to discriminatory conduct were factors in the respondent's actions. *Held*: the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case.

Swindell, Jennifer v. Lighthouse Inn
0840137
Kerr, 1/29/09

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in an employment case claiming retaliation and termination on the basis of race (African-American) and having opposed discrimination. The complainant was awarded back pay ($8,000), emotional distress ($1,000) and prejudgment and postjugment interest.

Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies
0510366
Knishkowy, 11/19/07

Final decision. Judgment for complainant on CFEPA age discrimination claim; federal ADEA claim raised via General Statutes 46a-58(a) denied because referee has no authority to adjudicate federal age discrimination cases via 46a-58(a). The complainant was terminated during the respondent's reduction in work force (RIF). When the complainant asked his supervisor if he (complainant) was selected for layoff because of his age, the supervisor

stated, “Yes. We keep the younger people.” Because of the direct nature of the credible evidence—the statement by the de facto decision maker at the time of and in the context of the termination—the case was analyzed under the Price-Waterhouse mixed motive paradigm. The complainant’s satisfaction of his evidentiary burden, shifted the burden to the respondent to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it nonetheless terminated the complainant for other valid reasons. The supervisor’s credibility was damaged by his demeanor and attitude on the stand, his faulty memory, and inconsistencies with other testimony—both his own and that of others. The supervisor also did not follow the protocol established for the RIF process, further weakening his justification for the choices of who would be terminated and who would remain. The complainant was awarded back pay plus interest.

Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies
0510366
Knishkowy, 12/27/07

Ruling on reconsideration. Back pay award increased (a) to correct a typographical error in final decision, and (b) to include complainant’s out-of-pocket costs of obtaining health insurance for period of seven months. Inclusion of annual merit increases (had complainant not been terminated) in calculations was rejected as too speculative, since merit increases were subjective-based and in the past were not given every year.

Tabatabai, Ahmadali v RainDance Technologies, Inc.
0830168
Bromley, 8/28/2012

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. On November 2, 2007, the complainant filed a complaint, alleging in part, that he had been harassed and given poor evaluations because of his national origin and religion. On February 2, 2021, he filed an amended complaint alleging retaliation for having about discriminatory conduct. The respondent’s motion to dismiss was denied without prejudice to the harassment and poor evaluation claims because there was insufficient evidence to determine whether the claims were untimely or part of a pattern. The motion to dismiss the amended claim was granted as untimely because it alleged a new and different cause of action.

Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc.
0420316
Knishkowy, 6/30/06

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent liable for sex discrimination when it terminated the complainant because of her pregnancy. The complainant recovered back pay, interest, and certain travel expenses associated with new job. However, back pay and travel expenses recoverable only until the time the respondent went out of business (a year prior to judgment), as complainant would have been lawfully dismissed at that time. Front pay disallowed for the same reason. Emotional distress damages awarded under §46a-86(c), based on the premise that a violation of Title VII constituted a violation of §46a-58(a)

[following the CT Supreme Court's decision in *CHRO v. Board of Education of Town of Cheshire*, 270 Conn. 665 (2004)].

Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc.
0420316
Knishkowy, 10/5/06

Modified final decision on reconsideration. In initial final decision (6/30/06), the respondent's liability established by order of default, but back pay damages awarded only up until the time the respondent ceased business (one year before issuance of this decision). On reconsideration, the back pay award was increased by one week, in light of document showing the correct date of the respondent's dissolution.

Tavares, Cori v. Sam's Club, Wal-Mart Stores Inc.
9730092
(decision vacated on appeal by stipulated judgment)
Wilkerson, 11/8/99

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent due to the complainant's failure to appear for the public hearing. Sanctions in the form of attorney fees and court reporter costs imposed against the complainant's attorney.

Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection
0910275 (appeal pending)
Wright, 10/09/2018

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. CHRO has subject matter jurisdiction over the complainant's allegations that the respondent denied his application for a professional engineering license under Class 4 reciprocity because of his national origin and criminal record. Nonetheless, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and the complainant is ordered to fil a revised complaint.

Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection
910275 (appeal pending)
Wright, 12/12/2018

Complaint dismissed for failure to comply with prior order to file a revised complaint.

Taylor, Thaddeus v Salvation ARC
1010252
Wilson, 02/27/2012

Ruling. The complainant's motion to amend his complaint denied as he had previously obtained a release of jurisdiction.

Thompson, Nicole v Marc & Marie Pennino and John & Karen Bauco
0450008
(appeal withdrawn)
Austin, 03/02/07

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held; The complainant proved she was denied an advertised apartment for rent due to her source of income (section 8) in violation of 46a-64c (a) (3). The basis of the finding was found under a strict liability interpretation of the statute in that the respondents stated to the complainant that section 8 was not being accepted. Damages for both emotional distress and loss of the section 8 benefit were awarded totaling $15,280.69. Attorney fees were awarded in the amount of $42,493.50 after having reduced the original fee request.

Thompson, Nicole v. Marc & Marie Pennino
0450008
(appeal withdrawn)
Austin, 07/08/07

Final decision on reconsideration. The respondent's petition for reconsideration requested that certain factual findings be corrected to comport with the testimony at the public hearing along with reconsideration of legal conclusions reached that supported the finding in complainant's favor. Held: After granting the petition to reconsider, and having conducted a hearing on the respondent's petition the final decision was modified to correct two facts (paragraphs 12 and 24) contained therein. In all other respects the decision was affirmed as originally rendered.

Tineo, Leonicio v Smart Choice Preservation
1730253
Wright, 08/14/2019

Hearing in damages. *Held*: the complainant awarded $2,378 in backpay; $45,000 in emotional distress damages and pre- and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $7,008 as reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Toepelt, Rochelle v. Nailtique aks Nailtique, Inc.
0720118
Wilson, 12/13/2013

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to file an answer in a denial of services case predicated upon disability discrimination. The complainant was awarded $250 in emotional distress damages and $445.76 in damages.

Torrad Assoc. LLC, Gallant, Michelle v.
1830431
FitzGerald, 02/18/2022

The complainant filed a complaint alleging, in part, that her son had been denied medical services in retaliation for the child's father having previously filed a discrimination complaint with the commission. The respondent moved to dismiss arguing, in part, that the child was not within the zone of interests under the statutes. *Held:* motion denied. General Statutes §§ 46a-60(b)(4) and 46a-64 provide a cause of action for associational discrimination.

Treacy, Kathy v Vitas Innovative Hospice Care
1320021
Wright, 04/04/2017

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her in the terms and conditions of her employment based on her learning disability and/or mental disorder. *Held*: the complainant established her prima facie case and that the respondent's articulated reasons for terminating the employment relationship were a pretext for intentional discrimination. The complainant was awarded $73,401.30 in backpay; $43,877.03 in prejudgment interest on the backpay; and $6,253.44 in reimbursement for travel expenses.

Turner, Laurie v. Ritz Realty, Quality Towing
9920135, 9920136
FitzGerald, 6/22/99

Hearing in damages. Criteria for emotional distress damages. One complainant is awarded $125.00 in economic damages.

Turner, Tammy v Dept. of Developmental Services
1010190
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. *Held*: the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's decision to terminate her employment was motivated by discriminatory animus and failed to establish the respondent failed to provide her with a reasonable accommodation.

Urban, Stephen v United Pet Supply, Inc.
0830309
Bromley, 8/2/2012

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to appear at hearing. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated his employment because of his physical disability.

Respondent ordered to pay the complainant $1236 for back pay and reimburse the State of Connecticut $1764 in unemployment compensation.

Vargas, Alsenet v Dept of Correction
1110437
Mount, 01/10/2013

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Genral Statutes sections 46a-58(a)m 46a-64(a) and 46a-71 when it denied her the right to nurse her child in the correctional facility's visiting room while visiting her incarcerated husband. *Held*: correctional facilities visiting rooms are not places of public accommodation under General Statute Section 46a-63. Further, the respondent did not discriminate in providing services as General Statute Section 46a-71 does not apply because a correctional facility does not serve the general public.

Vendryes, Kathrine v. Roadway Package Systems, Inc.
9830539
Knishkowy, 11/18/99

Ruling on interrogatories. Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery limited by Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Vidal, Robert v. Metro-North Railroad Co.
0630646
(appeal dismissed)
FitzGerald, 10/16/08

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it failed to promote him because of his national origin and color. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss claiming that the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The respondent argued that it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, organized under the laws of the State of New York. As a result of a compact between Connecticut and New York, codified in General Statutes §§ 16-343 and 16-344, the respondent operates a commuter rail service in Connecticut and is exempted by Connecticut's legislature from state regulation, including exemption from Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws.

Held: the respondent is in the business of providing mass transportation and railroad service pursuant to the Connecticut – New York compact and is the beneficiary of the exemption in § 16-344 (a). Its promotion of employees involved in its mass transportation and railroad service is within its routine and normal business operations. Based on the Connecticut Supreme Court's decision in *Greenwich v Connecticut Transportation Authority*, 166 Conn. 337 (1974), the exemption in § 16-344 (a) applies to this case. Therefore, the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction of this claim and the motion to dismiss is granted.

Volpintesta, Lou v. International Athletic Association of Basketball Officials
9910120
Giliberto, 7/29/99

Hearing in damages. Part-time high school basketball referee awarded: (1) back pay (2) front pay (3) membership dues; (4) various equitable remedies.

Walley, Terry v. Dept. of Correction
0020470
FitzGerald, 7/31/02

Motion to amend the complaint to add a claim of retaliation denied. The proposed amendment repeated allegations of retaliation contained in a subsequent complaint filed by the complainant. This subsequent complaint was dismissed by the investigator who found that the allegations of retaliation were not supported by the record. The commission then issued a release of its jurisdiction over the subsequent complaint and the allegations therein.

Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc.
0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)
FitzGerald, 8/30/02

Final decision. Held: The complainant established that she was physically disabled, the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was aware of her disability, her request for a variance to attach her detached garage to her house was a reasonable accommodation and the ZBA denied the request. She also established that the denial was a continuing violation based upon the ZBA's ongoing, and incorrect, policy that federal and state disability/fair housing laws do not supersede zoning restrictions. The ZBA failed to establish that the complainant's proposed accommodation was unreasonable. The complainant failed to engage in good faith, interactive dialogue with the respondents on alternative locations for the construction of her garage that would have reasonably accommodated her disability without requiring a variance. The ZBA was ordered to grant the complainant a variance to attach the garage to her house. The complainant's request for emotional distress and attorney's fees was denied.

Warner, Stephen v NERAC, Inc.
0840031
Mount, 08/02/2012

Motion to dismiss. The respondent's motion to dismiss contends that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear an age discrimination claim because of the minimum age requirement under the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act, that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear a claim for familial status under Section 46a-60(a)(1) and that ERISA pre-empts jurisdiction of the complainant's health insurance claim. *Held*: the commission has subject matter jurisdiction over age and sex discrimination claims, and the complainant is not asserting a claim directly connected to the health insurance plan.

Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley
0840031
Mount, 12/13/2012

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated from his employment because of his age and his wife's pregnancy. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating her employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection
0710348
Wilkerson Brillant, 05/19/09

Motion to dismiss granted in part; denied in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent failed to accommodate her disability, subjected her to unequal terms and conditions of employment and terminated her because of her physical disability and her age in violation of General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a), 46a-60 (a) (1), 46a-70, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) and the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). The respondent moved to dismiss the complaint arguing this tribunal lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the doctrine of sovereign immunity bars the state claims, the § 46a-70 claim applies to named state officials, and that § 46a-58 (a) did not cover the federal claims. Ruling: The complainant's state claims fall within the exceptions of §§ 4-142 (2) and (3), and § 46a-70 applies to employment discrimination in state agencies where no individual state officials are named defendants. The complainant's ADA and Title VII claims are covered under § 46a-58 (a), but age is not a protected class under § 46a-58 (a) and therefore complainant's ADEA claim is dismissed.

Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc.
1110081
Wright, 06/14/2016

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated because of his age and/ or disability. *Held:* the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's proffered business reason for the termination, declining job performance, was a pretext for discrimination.

Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc.
1110081
Wright, 07/26/2016

Ruling on motion for reconsideration of final decision of judgment for the respondent. Final decision clarified regarding direct evidence and stray remark. Reconsideration denied.

Weller-Bajrami, Catherine v. Lawrence Crest Cooperative, Inc.
99500095, 9950096
Trojanowski, 8/28/01

Hearing in damages. Claim by a tenant of the respondent and her children that they were discriminated against because of her race, white, her sex, female, and her physical disability, chronic ulcerative colitis. The complainant's children were not awarded any damages. The complainant was awarded the following types of damages: security deposits, moving costs, rent differentials, the cost of alternative housing, utility (electric bill) differentials, $20,000 for her emotional distress and $6,562 for attorney's fees.

Whitney, Robert v Regal Stageways Limousines
0630256
Bromley, 3/26/2012

Age, mitigation of damages, interest, post-judgment interest

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to appear and file an answer in employment termination case predicated upon age discrimination. The complainant was awarded back pay ($59,302), prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest.

Williams, Robert v. M.N.S. Corporation
0010124
Knishkowy, 3/1/01

Hearing in damages. The respondent's liability determined by entry of order of default. Award of back pay made to black employee who was terminated from truck-driving position and subsequently replaced by white driver.

Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley
0840008
Mount, 04/18/2018

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that her employment was terminated because of her age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating her employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Young, Claude v. City of Stamford Police Dept.
0720418
FitzGerald, 11/18/09

Motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated § 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64 and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment when he was subjected to excessive use of force, police brutality, verbally

abusive language and racial slurs. Held: the respondent is a public accommodation for purposes of § 46a-64, and the complaint may be amended to allege additional facts to show an equal protection violation enforceable through § 46a-58 (a).

III. Decisions/ruling listed alphabetically by respondent

3M Purification and 3M Cuno, Jorge Collazo v.
0940298
Mount, 01/29/2014

Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that he was subjected to harassment, and unequal tr4eatment due to hi national origin and ancestry. He later amended his complaint to include a claim of that he was terminated in retaliation for his filing of the complaint. *Held*: the complainant proved that the responded discriminated against him. He was awarded backpay of $70,988.35; prejudgment interest of $31,944.75; attorney fees of $24,580; emotional distress damages of $5000 and post-judgment interest.

ACE International (ACE American Ins. Co.), John Ellis v.
0620473
FitzGerald, 09/13/10

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. The complainant's § 46a-58 (a), Title VII retaliation and ADEA claims dismissed. Commission lacks jurisdiction because retaliation and age are not enumerated as protected bases under § 46a-58 (a). Motion dismissed as to the complainant's § 46a-60 (a) (4) retaliation claim as (1) the claim is not time-barred and (2) whether the alleged acts would dissuade a reasonable worker from making or supporting a charge of discrimination is an evidentiary matter not a jurisdictional defect.

ACE International (ACE American Ins. Co.), John Ellis v.
0620473
FitzGerald, 10/25/10

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent asserted lack of subject matter jurisdiction, lack of personal jurisdiction and improper extraterritorial application of state's anti-discrimination laws. Held: (1) the commission has subject matter jurisdiction under § 46a-60 over a claim that an employee was terminated because of his age an in retaliation for his opposition to discriminatory employment practices; (2) a decision made in Connecticut that has extraterritorial effect does not make the application of the law extraterritorial and Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws may, in some cases be applied extraterritorially; and, (3) the commission and the complainant established that the commission's exercise of personal jurisdiction satisfies statutory and constitutional requirements.

Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Computer Engineering Technology, Rosa Maria Agvent v.
0020042
Trojanowski, 4/11/01

Hearing in damages. Female computer worker awarded backpay, compound prejudgment interest, statutory postjudgment interest, and other equitable relief.

David v AFSCME Council #4, David Kaplan v.
121003
Bromley, 05/21/2014

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent denied him a position as a legislative field organizer because of his in violation of General Statute 46a-60(a)(1) and the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). *Held*: ADEA claim dismissed because this forum has no jurisdiction over ADEA claims. Section 46a-60(a)(1) claim dismissed because the respondent had made all its hiring selections for the available openings by the time that the complainant applied for the position.

Alan S. Goodman, Inc., Arnell Barnes v.
0710395
Levine, 6/5/2009

Motion for summary judgment: denied. Held: (1) human rights referees have the authority to rule on motions for summary judgment; and (2) issue of material issue of fact exists as evident by the complaint affidavit alleging discrimination based on color (black) and disparate treatment, production compliance resulting in some documentation of disparate treatment and the respondent's vigorous denial of discrimination.

Allied World Assurance Company, Rowe, CarolAnne v.
1810381
FitzGerald, 12/29/2021

The respondent's motion for sanctions for failing to comply with an order to produce documents was granted. Sanctions included exclusion of documents and testimony.

American Can Company, Robert Flood v.
8220420
FitzGerald, 4/24/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was the victim of age discrimination that occurred when the respondent, undergoing a reduction in force, failed to transfer the complainant into a lateral job position. Held*:* the complainant failed to prove his prima facie case, that the respondent's reason was pretextual, and that he was the victim of intentional age discrimination.

Ansonia, Town of, Claude Perry v.
9730481
Knishkowy, 12/20/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* Although the commission investigator found reasonable cause on one allegation in the complaint, and no reasonable cause on the other three allegations, the *entire complaint* was certified for public hearing in accordance with the plain and unambiguous language of § 46a-84. Once a complaint is certified, the Referee must conduct a *de novo* hearing on the entire complaint and not rely upon the investigator's report as a basis for dismissal.

Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield, Rachael Leftridge v.
9830218
Knishkowy, 1/22/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. African-American complainant alleged that the respondent failed to promote her because of her race. The complainant had worked for the respondent for nine years, yet the promotion was given to a white co-worker who had only worked for one year. Although the complainant was qualified for the promotion and met her prima facie case, the respondent justified its decision by demonstrating that the promoted employee was better qualified. The complainant failed to show that the respondent's reason lacked credence or that it masked an unlawful discriminatory motive.

Ascent Service & Technologies, LLC, Ann Franuenhofer v
1010090
Wilson, 06/03/2013

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment because of her participation in a protective activity. *Held*: the complainant's evidence failed to establish that the respondent's proffered legitimate business reason was a pretext for retaliation or to show that the respondent possessed a retaliatory motive.

Ash, Mark, Arouna Soulemani v.
0230045
Allen, 01/08/04

Hearing in damages. By virtue of a default for failure to appear, the respondent was held liable for discrimination based on race, color and ancestry against the complainant with regard to the terms and conditions of his employment and for terminating his employment. The complainant was awarded $45,405 as back pay and monetary relief and post judgment interest at the rate of 10% compounded annually. Front pay was not awarded.

ATOS IT Solutions and Services, Inc., Stephanie Danner v.
1730314 (on appeal, remanded)
Wright, 02/22/2019

Motion for summary judgment. In her complaint, the complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her on the basis of her mental disability and retaliated against her. In its motion for summary judgment, the respondent argued that the complainant cannot establish the prima facie elements of her case because there was no reasonable accommodation that it could provide to enable her to perform the essential functions of her job. Further, it argued that the complainant could not refute its legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for terminating her employment, namely layoffs over an extended period of time. The respondent filed supporting affirmative evidence and affidavits in support of its position. The complainant provided no affidavits or other evidence to establish a factual basis for the challenged elements. *Held*: motion granted. The complainant and commission failed to offer any counter affidavits or evidentiary material to demonstrate the existence of genuine issues of material facts.

Atlantic Communications, Corp., Maria Sanchez v.,
0430462
Kerr, 03/08/05

Hearing in damages. The complainant filed her affidavit of discriminatory practice on March 12, 2004, alleging sexual harassment and wrongful termination (on the basis of her sex) in violation of General Statutes §§ 46a-58(a) and 46a-60(a)(1) and Title VII. The respondent was defaulted on January 5, 2005 for failure to file an answer and a hearing in damages was held on February 17, 2005. The respondent was ordered to cease and desist in further sexual harassment, to pay the complainant $8,402.70 in back pay, to reimburse the state $3, 718.00 in unemployment compensation benefits paid to the complainant, and to pay pre- and postjudgment interest on both amounts at the rate of 10% per annum.

Avalon Properties, Patricia Helliger v.
9730397
Allen, 12/20/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) the respondent Real Estate Management Corporation and its named agents discriminated against the complainant by making a rental opportunity unavailable and by misrepresenting the availability of a rental in violation of §§ 46a-64c(a)(1) and 46a-64c(a)(4)(A); (2) complainant awarded $3,000.00 damages suffered as a result of emotional distress at discriminatory treatment; (3) the complainant failed to mitigate her economic losses and no economic compensatory damages awarded.

Bauer, Inc., Alfred Parker Mayo v.
0831066
Wilson, 3/25/2013

Motion to dismiss granted. At the conclusion of the complainant's case, the respondent moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to establish a prima facie case. Motion granted pursuant to section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies because

the complainant failed to present evidence of a discriminatory motive in the respondent's decision to terminate his employment and failed to produce evidence that he was qualified for the position.

Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut , Lugenia Blake v.
9530630
Allen, 7/8/99

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) human rights referees have authority to dismiss matters; (2) prior administrative decision by a separate state agency is given res judicata effect; (3) the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case for employment discrimination.

Bidwell Healthcare Center, Francis Okonkwo v.
9940144
FitzGerald, 2/5/01

Motion to dismiss denied in part, granted in part. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction based on reasonable cause findings. The respondent claimed that the investigator (1) found no reasonable cause to believe that the complainant had been sexually harassed; and (2) improperly found reasonable cause for an allegation, disparate treatment, not alleged in the complaint. Held*:* (1) motion granted as to the sexual harassment claim because the investigator concluded that the investigation did not support the complainant's allegations of sexual harassment; and (2) denied as to the disparate treatment claim because the complaint alleged sufficient facts to put the respondent on notice that the allegation would reasonably fall within the scope of the investigation.

Big Enough, Inc., Jennifer Taranto v.
0420316
Knishkowy, 6/30/06

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent liable for sex discrimination when it terminated the complainant because of her pregnancy. The complainant recovered back pay, interest, and certain travel expenses associated with new job. However, back pay and travel expenses recoverable only until the time the respondent went out of business (a year prior to judgment), as complainant would have been lawfully dismissed at that time. Front pay disallowed for the same reason. Emotional distress damages awarded under §46a-86(c), based on the premise that a violation of Title VII constituted a violation of §46a-58(a) [following the CT Supreme Court's decision in *CHRO v. Board of Education of Town of Cheshire*, 270 Conn. 665 (2004)].

Big Enough, Inc., Jennifer Taranto v.
0420316
Knishkowy, 10/5/06

Modified final decision on reconsideration. In initial final decision (6/30/06), the respondent's liability established by order of default, but back pay damages awarded only up until the time

the respondent ceased business (one year before issuance of this decision). On reconsideration, the back pay award was increased by one week, in light of document showing the correct date of the respondent's dissolution.

Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc., Barry Weinz v.
1110081
Wright, 06/14/2016

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated because of his age and/ or disability. *Held:* the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's proffered business reason for the termination, declining job performance, was a pretext for discrimination.

Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc., Barry Weinz v.
1110081
Wright, 07/26/2016

Ruling on motion for reconsideration of final decision of judgment for the respondent. Final decision clarified regarding direct evidence and stray remark. Reconsideration denied.

Black Point Beach Association, Inc., Carol Ward v..
0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)
FitzGerald, 8/30/02

Final decision. Held: The complainant established that she was physically disabled, the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was aware of her disability, her request for a variance to attach her detached garage to her house was a reasonable accommodation and the ZBA denied the request. She also established that the denial was a continuing violation based upon the ZBA's ongoing, and incorrect, policy that federal and state disability/fair housing laws do not supersede zoning restrictions. The ZBA failed to establish that the complainant's proposed accommodation was unreasonable. The complainant failed to engage in good faith, interactive dialogue with the respondents on alternative locations for the construction of her garage that would have reasonably accommodated her disability without requiring a variance. The ZBA was ordered to grant the complainant a variance to attach the garage to her house. The complainant's request for emotional distress and attorney's fees was denied.

Bloomfield, Town of, Donald J. Rajtar v.
0510115
Kerr, 10/03/07

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: An arbitration panel's finding that the complainant (a police officer) had been untruthful during an investigation and subsequent disciplinary action, and a subsequent superior court ruling that the complainant could not be returned to duty by the panel as a matter of public policy, did not preclude the commission from considering whether the complainant's termination was an impermissible discriminatory act. The decision

reasoned that discriminatory animus had not been considered by the town, panel or court, and that the complainant should be afforded the opportunity to establish that the finding of untruthfulness was pretext for a termination impermissibly predicated on the basis of his age. This case was distinguishable from *Sperow v. Regional School District No. 7,* CHRO No. 0130607).

Bloomfield, Town of, Donald J. Rajtar v.
0510115
(appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 10/03/07

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that he had been wrongfully terminated as a police officer by the respondent on the basis of age. The respondent's decision to terminate had been set aside by an arbitration panel, which had found the complainant had been untruthful during an investigation and subsequent disciplinary hearing but had reduced the termination to a 200 workday suspension. The complainant maintained that the charges against him, the disciplinary proceedings and his discharge were pretext for age discrimination. There was evidence of tolerated and department wide disparagement of older patrol officers, of disparate discipline predicated on age, and of an investigation of the complainant's alleged dishonesty so one sided and perfunctory as to lend substantial credence to the complainant's assertion that the disciplinary process, finding of dishonesty and resultant termination were but pretext for a wrongful termination predicated on age. The complainant was awarded $80,369.34 for back pay, accrued time in the amount of 687.97 hours, $19,79 .for medical expenses incurred as a result of loss of insurance, prejudgment interest from January 9, 2006, post judgment interest and other equitable relief.

Bloomfield, Town of, Donald J. Rajtar v
0510115
(appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 11/08/07

Petitions for reconsideration. The respondent, the complainant and the commission filed petitions to reconsider. The respondent's petition to reconsider the earlier denial of its motion to dismiss was denied. The complainant's and the respondent's petitions to reconsider the final decision was granted. Held: The final decision was affirmed and clarified to provide that the complainant be reinstated to full duty as a Bloomfield officer and that the final decision be implemented independent of any disposition in *Town of Bloomfield v. United Electrical Radio & Machine Workers of America*, 2006 WL 3491719 (Conn. Super.) because that matter is proceeding on a finding that the complainant (Rajtar) had been untruthful, which finding was rejected in the final decision as pretext advanced to impermissibly justify a termination effectuated because of age discrimination.

Bridgeport Board of Education, Angelo Cordone v.
0420409
Knishkowy, 7/21/04

Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part. Held: (1) The complainant's first allegation was based on a discrete event occurring more than 180 days prior to the filing of the complaint. Although in certain circumstances the 180-day filing requirement may be excused for equitable reasons, the commission, in its response to the motion, provided no suggestion--much less any evidence--of any such reason. The motion to dismiss this portion of the complaint is granted. (2) The respondent challenged the second allegation by claiming that failure to transfer or promote the complainant to a certain position did not constitute an adverse employment action. Such determination is a matter of fact and thus requires full adjudication. The motion to dismiss this portion of the complaint is denied.

Bridgeport Board of Education, Angelo Cordone v.
0420409
Knishkowy, 9/21/04

Motion for leave to amend complaint. In an age discrimination case, the complainant moved to amend his complaint by adding legal conclusions of disability discrimination. Although the complainant argues that the additional charges clarify the factual allegations in the original complaint and "conform the legal grounds for the complaint with the factual allegations," such bald assertions are simply incorrect. Nothing in the original complaint so much as even alludes to any disability. The motion is denied. (Note: The respondent's failure to respond to the complainant's motion does not mandate automatic approval of the motion; rather, the presiding officer must still determine if the proposed amendment is "reasonable." See Regs. Conn. State Agencies, § 46a-54-80a(e).)

Bridgeport, City of, Liaquiat Ali v
0750131 & 0750132
Wilkerson, 11/14/07

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondents (City of Bridgeport and Bridgeport planning and zoning commission) moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction as to the city arguing that the city had no authority to amend or enforce the zoning regulations. CHRO argued that the complaint against alleged discrimination in housing and was not an appeal of a zoning regulation. Held*:* the city shall remain a respondent because it is inferred that the planning and zoning commission is an authorized decision-maker for the city and acted as a policy maker for the city when it enforced the zoning regulations.

Brookfield, Town of, Joyce Clements v.
9620571
Allen, 7/6/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant brought an action claiming harassment and demotion based on her age and amended her complaint to assert wrongful discharge based on age and gender. Held*:* (1) The complainant's amended complaint was filed more than 180 days after the alleged act of discrimination; (2) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case; (3) The respondent's articulated non-discriminatory reason was valid and not pre-textual; (4) The complainant failed to produce evidence inferring that the abolition of her position in the Town's budget was motivated by her age or gender; (5) there was no evidence of the complainant being harassed or demoted.

Cantillon, Richard, Kelly Howard v.
1550288 (appeal pending)
Wright, 06/12/2017

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged that her neighbor, the respondent, harassed and threatened her on the basis of her race and color. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $157.15 in reimbursement for travel expenses and $15,000 in emotional distress damages. *(On appeal, remanded for further consideration of damages in light of Patino v Birken Manufacturing Co., 304 Conn 679 (2012).*

Cantillon, Richard, Kelly Howard v.
1550288 (appeal pending)
Wright, 08/17/2018

Hearing in damages on remand. The complainant alleged that her neighbor, the respondent, harassed and threatened her on the basis of her race and color. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $157.15 in reimbursement for travel expenses and $15,000 in emotional distress damages.

Carfi, Jeffrey, Judy Hartling v.
0550116
Knishkowy, 10/26/06

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondents liable for retaliation (in response to prior CHRO complaint) and for housing discrimination and harassment based on the complainant's sexual orientation. Pursuant to §46a-86(c) the referee awarded the complainant $1315 for various costs and $25,000 for emotional distress damages.

Cheshire Bd. of Ed., Chillon Ballard v.
9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)
Giliberto, 7/15/99

Motion to dismiss granted in part. Held*:* (1) the commission does not have jurisdiction over claims pursuant to §10-15c; (2) public schools are not public accommodations; (3) the commission does not have concurrent jurisdiction with the Dept of Education pursuant to §46a-58 and §46a-64(a)(2). On appeal, Superior Court vacated the referee's dismissal, found that the commission does have jurisdiction to hear complaints of discrimination against students in public schools, and remanded the case for further proceedings.

Cheshire Bd. of Ed., Chillon Ballard v. 9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)
Giliberto, 5/31/00

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) General Statutes § 46a-75 does not apply to public schools; and (2) the commission through the human rights referee does not have the authority to transfer this matter to the State Board of Education. On appeal, Superior Court vacated the referee's dismissal, found that the commission does have jurisdiction to hear complaints of discrimination against students in public schools, and remanded the case for further proceedings.

Cheshire Bd. of Ed., Chillon Ballard v.
9830294
FitzGerald, 11/15/05

Amended ruling re: the respondent's motion to vacate. The respondent requested reconsideration of an order granting the commission's motion to compel. The respondent claimed that producing the documents would violate the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The respondent's motion denied as the requested documents were within statutory exceptions.

Cheshire Bd. of Ed., Chillon Ballard v.
9830294
FitzGerald, 12/12/05

The respondent's motion for sanctions and to dismiss the complaint granted in part, denied in part. The complainant failed to comply with order to produce documents responsive to the respondent's production request. Because the requested documents were not relevant to the parties' burden of proof as to whether a discriminatory act occurred, the complaint was not dismissed. Because the requested documents were relevant as to the impact of the alleged discriminatory act on the complainant as his claim for emotional damages, the complainant and the commission are prohibited from introducing any oral or documentary evidence that the complainant sought and/or received treatment for emotional distress as a result of the alleged discriminatory act and they are prohibited from introducing any oral or documentary

evidence of the impact the alleged discriminatory act had on the complainant's subsequent educational and employment performance after he withdrew from Cheshire High School.

Children & Families, Dept. of, John Moore v.
07310209
Levine, 10/20/2009

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) General Statute 46a-58 (a) converts a violation of federal anti-discrimination laws into a violation of Connecticut anti-discrimination laws. The timing requirement for filing a complaint is that under state law. (2) It is premature to grant a motion to dismiss, given the generalized claims of sexual discrimination. (3) The issue is whether the complainant is entitled to offer evidence in support of his claim. (4) At this stage in the administrative proceedings, it is not possible to accurately assess the validity of the respondent's claims that there is no jurisdiction over the original complaint or the amendments. (5) The complainant's claims allege employment discrimination, not workplace violence, and there is no pre-emption of jurisdiction.

Children and Families, Dept. of, Anthony Kinder v.
0730367
Kerr, 4/21/10

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in being denied a promotion to the position of social work supervisor because of his race (African-American) and color (black), in violation of General Statutes § 46a-58 (a), 46a-60 (a) (1) and Title Vll. Because of the manifold safety valves built in to the interview and selection process by the respondent to safeguard against discriminatory animus interjecting itself into the selection process, the racial and ethnic composition of the interview panels and the diversity and qualifications of the successful candidates, the complainant was unable to establish a prima-facie case.

City Hall Café, Mark Lauray v.
1530333
Wright, 03/31/2016

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $831 in backpay and $8,000 in emotional distress damages.

Clark, Stephen, Ronald Little v.
9810387
Knishkowy, 9/1/99

Motion to dismiss as to one of 3 respondents denied. Motion did not include affidavits or other supporting documents other than excerpts from investigator's reasonable cause finding. Held*:* (1) Although commission investigator had found no reasonable cause as to him, the entire complaint was certified for public hearing; therefore the Referee cannot rely upon the investigator's findings as a basis for dismissing the case. Once a complaint is

certified for public hearing, the Referee must conduct *de novo* proceeding on the merits; and (2) If evidence exists to exonerate him, it must be presented at the public hearing.

Clark, Stephen, Ronald Little v.
9810387
Knishkowy, 8/2/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant, who suffered from Parkinson's disease, brought action under state and federal fair housing statutes alleging that the respondents, teenage boys in the neighborhood, discriminated against him because of his disabilities. Held*:* The complainant proved that the respondents harassed him because of his disability and created a hostile housing environment. The respondents were found liable for property damage, costs, attorneys fees, and emotional distress.

Claywell Electric, Jane Doe v.
0510199
Kerr, 12/09/08

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon sexual discrimination/harassment and constructive discharge. The complainant was awarded back pay ($3,120), emotional distress ($15,000) and prejudgment interest ($1,310).

C.N. Flagg Power, Inc., Joseph Carter v.
8840227
FitzGerald, 2/28/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) termination of employment due to physical disability (cancer). The complainant proved discrimination by both the direct and inferential evidence standards. The respondent failed to show a bona fide occupational qualification and the showed that the respondent's claims of essential job function were not worthy of credence; and (2) the complainant proved that the respondent aided and abetted in his termination.

Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc. Cecil Ramseur v.
0440130
(stipulated agreement on appeal)
FitzGerald, 11/28/05

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged he was terminated because of his age. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear at the hearing conference and for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded back pay of $35,535.99 and additional relief.

Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc., Cecil Ramseur v.
0440130
(stipulated agreement on appeal)
FitzGerald, 12/30/05

Motions to stay, to reconsider back pay calculation and to reopen default judgment were denied. Back pay was properly calculated from date of discriminatory termination to date of judgment, less mitigation. The length of the complainant's employment with the respondent and his separation from subsequent employment do not preclude the accrual of back pay. The respondent failed to show mistake, accident or other reasonable cause to justify setting aside the default judgment.

Comfort Suites, Elizabeth Lopes v.
0540252
Austin, 10/25/05

Hearing in damages. After having been sexually harassed by a co-worker, the complainant complained to her supervisor who took no remedial action. The complainant again complained to her supervisor after a third instance of being sexually harassed by the same co-worker. The supervisor's response was "we are all family, enjoy it and I don't want to hear it." The following day the complainant was terminated. Discrimination was found for having previously opposed a discriminatory practice. The complainant was awarded back pay of $23,225.50 with postjudgment interest, reinstatement to the position she held at the time of termination, and front pay until such time as the complainant is reinstatement or rejects an offer of reinstatement.

Comptroller, Office of the State, Sharon Friedman v.
0110195
Allen, 11/17/03

The complainant made application for "domestic partner benefits" and was denied same on basis that state arbitration award providing such benefits applied only to same sex partners as they were unable to marry under state law. The complainant alleged that she was discriminated against by the arbitration award, because her "partner" was male, on the basis of her marital status and sexual orientation the respondent moved to dismiss complaint for failure to state a claim for which relief could be afforded. HELD: the respondent's Motion to Dismiss granted as Chapter 68 of the CGS (Section 5-276 et seq.) provides for finality of such an award unless a timely motion to vacate is filed with the Superior Court, and there having been none the award is not now subject to a collateral attack through the auspices of a CHRO complaint.

Consumer Protection, Dept. of, David Taylor v.
0910275 (appeal pending)
Wright, 10/09/2018

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. CHRO has subject matter jurisdiction over the complainant's allegations that the respondent denied his application for a professional engineering license under Class 4 reciprocity because of his national origin and criminal record. Nonetheless, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and the complainant is ordered to fil a revised complaint.

Consumer Protection, Dept. of, David Taylor v.
0910275 (appeal pending)
Wright, 12/12/2018

Complaint dismissed for failure to comply with prior order to file a revised complaint.

Correction, Dept. of, Frank Dexter v.
0320165
FitzGerald, 08/31/2005

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The respondent terminated the complainant's employment as a correction officer because he violated the administrative directive against undue familiarity with inmates by using his personal cell phone to make calls on behalf of inmates. The complainant, an African-American, alleged that the respondent did not terminate non-African Americans who had been cited for undue familiarity. Held: the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case because of his repeated violations of the administrative directive and because the non-African American correction officers to whom he compared himself were not similarly situated as their conduct were not as severe as the complainant's. Even if the prima facie elements were established, the complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent's business reason was a pretext for actual discrimination.

Correction, Dept. of, Mary L. Johnson v.
9740163
Giliberto, 8/20/99

Motion to stay pending declaratory ruling from the commission denied. Held*:* (1) Executive Director cannot file motions as she is represented by the commission counsel; (2) Chief Human Rights Referee performs administrative function and cannot rule in place of presiding human rights referees; (3) We have duty to address matters in more expedient fashion than the court system; and (4) Declaratory Rulings are no more binding than final decisions in other contested cases and do not require halt to all potentially related proceedings.

Correction, Dept. of, Mary L. Johnson v.
9740163
Giliberto, 3/9/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) The complainant is an "individual with a disability" due to her physical impairments of asthma and degenerative arthritis which are found to substantially limit the major life activities of breathing and walking; (2) The complainant was not qualified to perform the essential functions of her job and therefore failed to set forth a prima facie case under the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act; (3) the complainant's impairments of asthma and degenerative arthritis meet the definition of "physically disabled" under state law and the complainant established a prima facie case under state law; (4) the respondent proved the safety defense and her physical disabilities prevent her from performing her job.

Correction, Dept. of, Eunice Smith v.
9710718
Knishkowy, 5/4/00

Parties' third joint motion to extend deadline for legal briefs (on discovery issue) denied after two previous continuances had been granted. Even though parties are engaged in settlement negotiations, they remain obligated to meet previously-established deadlines set by human rights referee. For the same reason, deadline for exchange of witness lists and exhibit lists extended for only 4 business days. Extension of prehearing conference and hearing dates denied.

Correction, Dept. of, Terry Walley v.
0020470
FitzGerald, 7/31/02

Motion to amend the complaint to add a claim of retaliation Denied. The proposed amendment repeated allegations of retaliation contained in a subsequent complaint filed by the complainant. This subsequent complaint was dismissed by the investigator who found that the allegations of retaliation were not supported by the record. The commission then issued a release of its jurisdiction over the subsequent complaint and the allegations therein.

Correction, Dept. of, Alsenet Vargas v.
1110437
Mount, 01/10/2013

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Genral Statutes sections 46a-58(a)m 46a-64(a) and 46a-71 when it denied her the right to nurse her child in the correctional facility's visiting room while visiting her incarcerated husband. *Held*: correctional facilities visiting rooms are not places of public accommodation under General Statute Section 46a-63. Further, the respondent did not discriminate in providing services as General Statute Section 46a-71 does not apply because a correctional facility does not serve the general public.

Correction, Dept. of, Philip Brown v.
1230423
Wilson, 11/22/2013

Motion to dismiss. The respondent moved to dismiss the complainant's claims under General Statute Section 46a-60(a)(1) and (4) claims for failure to state a cause of action. *Held*: motion to dismiss denied but, treating the motion as a motion to strike, the complainant ordered to file an amended complainant regarding his Section 46a-60(a)(4) claim.

Correction, Dept. of, Philip Brown v.
1130416
Wilson, 11/26/2013 (corrected ruling)

Motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action. Motion denied. *Held*: when construed broadly and in a manner most favorable to the complainant, the fact alleged and necessarily implied are sufficient to state a claim.

Correction, Dept. of, Peter Roig v.
1330398
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Motion to dismiss as to the University of Connecticut Health Center. *Held*: the motion to dismiss as to the University of Connecticut Health Center (UCHC) granted. The complainant filed his complaint against the Department of Correction on March 25, 2013 and filed an amendment on September 15, 2014 to add the UCHC as a respondent. The amendment exceeds the 180-day statutory filing period of any alleged discriminatory conduct by UCHC and there is no evidence to support equitable tolling or constructive notice.

Correction, Dept. of, Peter Roig v.
1330398
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Motion to strike as to the Department of Correction. *Held*: motion granted in part and denied in part. Motion granted as to claims under Section 46a-64(a) and 46a-74 as the Department of Correction is not a public accommodation. Motion denied as to claims under Section 46a71 and 46a-77.

Creative Management Realty Co., Bradley Brown, Sr. v.
9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Giliberto, 11/16/99

Motion to dismiss granted in part. Held*:* (1) motion to dismiss is treated as a motion to strike; (2) § 46a-64c(a)(2) protects against discriminatory practices after the initial sale or rental transaction; (3) § 46a-64c(a)(3) does not apply solely to discrimination in advertising and includes verbal statements; (4) family members of disabled individuals are protected from discriminatory practices pursuant to § 46a-64c(a)(6)(B) and (C); (5) the discriminatory acts alleged against respondent management company and the respondent property manager do not constitute "residential real-estate-related transactions" pursuant to § 46a-64(a)(7); and (6) white persons are protected from racial discrimination under the state and federal fair housing laws.

Creative Management Realty Co., Bradley Brown, Sr. v.
9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069
Giliberto, 3/13/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held*:* All of the parties failed to appear for the public hearing, therefore the complainants and the commission failed to establish a prima facie case.

CT Family Care LLC, Dionne Garcia v.
1340202
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Corrected Hearing in Damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay of $4,650 and post-judgment interest.

CT Trane, Clive Duncan v
0410319
Kerr, 06/01/06

Motion to stay denied. The motion to stay was predicated on the filing of an action in federal court one month prior to the complaint's certification. The motion claimed that a stay was necessary to preserve (from the threat of preclusion) a right to a federal jury trial and to avoid duplication of effort. The motion was denied because the dual filing was at the complainant's option, preclusion issues could arise whether the stay was granted or not and because no compelling reason was advanced to indefinitely disenfranchise the commission from its statutory obligation to prosecute discrimination complaints.

Darien Barber Shop, Susan Ferri v
0520471
FitzGerald, 4/15/08

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent claimed the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the complaint was brought against a trade name. Held: Courts have held that a trade name may be named as a defendant in an action. Further, by entering an appearance, an attorney acknowledges that the party named on the appearance form is an accurate legal designation of the party for purposes of the trial

David E. Purdy & Co., Thomas Nobili v.
0120389
Knishkowy, 1/17/03

Motion to dismiss/motion for summary judgment denied. Motion to dismiss may be viewed as motion for summary judgment when the issue is one of facts, not of jurisdiction. In motion for summary judgment, the tribunal's role is not to resolve issues of fact, but to determine if any issue of material fact exists. The movant bears the burden of demonstrating there is no genuine issue of material fact. Based on conflicting affidavits from two physicians, whether complainant's sinusitis and rhinitis were chronic impairments under state law is a question of fact to be decided by the referee. Additionally, the respondent's allegation that it had no notice of complainant's need for accommodation was amply contradicted by the complainant's affidavit; thus, this is also a factual matter requiring full adjudication.

David E. Purdy & Co., Thomas Nobili v.
0120389
Knishkowy, 2/6/04

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held: The complainant, a certified public accountant, failed to prove 4th prong of prima facie case in his state law complaint alleging termination because of his disability, sinusitis. Even if he had proven his prima facie case, he could not meet his ultimate burden of proving that his termination was motivated by a discriminatory animus. The complainant also failed to satisfy the prima facie case for his "failure to accommodate" state law claim because he did not need an accommodation in order to perform the essential functions of his job. The complainant finally failed to prove that his termination and other adverse employment actions constituted unlawful retaliation in violation of state antidiscrimination law.

DEKK Group dba Dunkin Donuts, LaToya Bentley-Meunier v.
1140322
Mount, 04/11/2012

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $17,619.90 in backpay; $7,500 in emotional distress damages and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Developmental Services, Dept. of, Tammy Turner v.
1010190
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. *Held*: the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's decision to terminate her employment was motivated by discriminatory animus and failed to establish the respondent failed to provide her with a reasonable accommodation.

Diageo North America, Muriel Magda v.
0420213
Knishkowy, 3/16/06

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent moved to dismiss two lesser allegations which the investigator had found to be untimely filed. The motion was unaccompanied by the investigator's report or any other pertinent documentation. The motion was denied because (1) the investigator certified the entire complaint—and not merely portions thereof--to public hearing, so the timeliness challenges will need to be addressed de novo at hearing; (2) the challenged allegations may be a part of a "continuing violation" and the complainant should have the opportunity to adduce evidence on this matter.

Drawbridge Inn Restaurant, Monica Carver v.
9940179
Allen, 6/12/02

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleges discrimination in the terms and conditions of her employment on the basis of her alienage (American Indian), and that she was discharged in retaliation for her complaints regarding alleged sexual harassment in the workplace. Held: The complainant failed to establish prima facie case as to her claim regarding discriminatory treatment in the terms and conditions of her employment. The complainant also failed to establish a prima facie case that she was fired in retaliation for her complaints because evidence showed, inter alia, that she quit her job.

DSMA Enterprises, Lishka Negron v.
0110448
FitzGerald, 04/11/03

Motion to dismiss the complainant because of the complainant's failure to appear at a hearing conference was Granted. Section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies and case law authorize the presiding referee to dismiss a complaint for the complainant's failure to attend a hearing or conference without just cause. Neither the commission nor the complainant offered any reason for the complainant's absence. The attendance of counsel for the commission is not an adequate substitute for the presence of the complainant, who is an independent party not represented by the commission.

East Haven Bd. of Ed., Dawn Alston on behalf of Terrel Alston v.
9830205
(on appeal stipulated judgment)
Manzione, 5/3/00

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) public schools are not public accommodations under General Statutes § 46a-64(a); (2) the commission does not have jurisdiction over allegations of discrimination brought pursuant to General Statutes § 10-15c; and (3) General Statutes §§ 46a-75 and 46a-81m do not cover public schools.

Eastern Connecticut State University, Valerie Kennedy v
0140203
FitzGerald, 12/27/04

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment because of her sex, her disability, and in retaliation for her requesting accommodations for her disability. Held*:* the commission and the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's articulated business reason was a pretext for discrimination. Also, a violation of Title VII or the Rehabilitation Act is a violation of § 46a-58(a) and would entitle the commission and the complainant to the remedies available under § 46a-86(c).

Eastern Connecticut State University, Valerie Kennedy v.
0140203
FitzGerald, 01/28/05

The commission's motion to reconsider the final decision denied.

Echo Hose Ambulance and the City of Shelton, Brenda Puryear v.
1130518
Bromley, 01/10/2013

Motion to strike. Complainant alleged that the respondents discriminated against her on the basis of her race and color. *Held*: motion granted. There was no employment relationship as the complainant was a volunteer, not an employee.

Eckhaus, Eddie, Shirley Banks v.
0250115
Wilkerson, 5/23/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant who possessed a section 8 voucher attempted to rent a home from the respondent who refused to accept the voucher and would not allow the complainant to apply to rent the house. Discrimination based on lawful source of income and public advertising. The complainant awarded emotional distress damages of $4,500 and attorney fees.

Eckhaus, Eddie, Phyllis Hansberry v.
0250114
Wilkerson, 5/23/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant who possessed a section 8 voucher attempted to rent a home from the respondent who refused to accept the voucher and would not allow the complainant to apply to rent the house. Discrimination based on lawful source of income and public advertising. The complainant awarded emotional distress damages of $2,500, $931 for rent differential, $862.94 for storage costs and attorney fees.

Ed-Mor Electric Company, George T. Sloss v.
9930221
Manzione, 6/16/99

Hearing in damages. At a hearing in damages, where no one for the respondent appeared, the complainant was awarded $7,568.00 in back pay, $2,022.00 to reimburse the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation, $2,854.08 to reimburse the complainant's union for other benefits and $46.22/mo. For prejudgment interest for his claim of discrimination based on age.

EDAC Technologies, Adam Szydlo v
0510366
Knishkowy, 11/19/07

Final decision. Judgment for complainant on CFEPA age discrimination claim; federal ADEA claim raised via General Statutes 46a-58(a) denied because referee has no authority to adjudicate federal age discrimination cases via 46a-58(a). The complainant was terminated during the respondent's reduction in work force (RIF). When the complainant asked his supervisor if he (complainant) was selected for layoff because of his age, the supervisor stated, "Yes. We keep the younger people." Because of the direct nature of the credible evidence—the statement by the de facto decision maker at the time of and in the context of the termination—the case was analyzed under the Price-Waterhouse mixed motive paradigm. The complainant's satisfaction of his evidentiary burden, shifted the burden to the respondent to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it nonetheless terminated the complainant for other valid reasons. The supervisor's credibility was damaged by his demeanor and attitude on the stand, his faulty memory, and inconsistencies with other testimony—both his own and that of others. The supervisor also did not follow the protocol established for the RIF process, further weakening his justification for the choices of who would be terminated and who would remain. The complainant was awarded back pay plus interest.

EDAC Technologies, Adam Szydlo v.
0510366
Knishkowy, 12/27/07

Ruling on reconsideration. Back pay award increased (a) to correct a typographical error in final decision, and (b) to include complainant's out-of-pocket costs of obtaining health insurance for period of seven months. Inclusion of annual merit increases (had complainant not been terminated) in calculations was rejected as too speculative, since merit increases were subjective-based and in the past were not given every year.

Education, Dept. of, Claire T. Doyle v.
9730257
FitzGerald, 8/18/00

Motion to dismiss a portion of the complaint that was incorporated by an amendment is granted. The amendment alleges essentially the same facts as a subsequent complaint filed by the complainant against the respondent. Because the complainant obtained a release of jurisdiction under §§ 46a-100 and –101 of the subsequent complaint, General Statutes § 46a-101(d) waives the commission's jurisdiction as to allegations for which the release was obtained, proscribes the commission from continuing to prosecute the allegations, and requires the dismissal of the allegations in whatever form the allegations may take.

Education, Dept. of, Claire T. Doyle v.
9730257
FitzGerald, 9/15/00

Motion to dismiss granted. The commission moved for an administrative dismissal pursuant to a request by the complainant for a release of jurisdiction.

Edwards Super Food Stores, Robert Henry v.
9510617
Manzione, 7/22/99

Motion to dismiss postponed for evidentiary hearing. Held*:* There are questions of fact as to whether the complaint against additional named the respondents should be dismissed (i.e. whether "successor liability" should attach and whether to "pierce the corporate veil"). Accordingly, a conference call shall be scheduled to discuss limited discovery on this issue and set a date for an evidentiary hearing on this jurisdictional question.

Edwards Super Food Stores, Robert Henry v.
9510617
Manzione, 9/1/99

Motion to dismiss and the commission's motion for stay. Held*:* (1) a parent corporation may be dismissed from an action when allegations are brought against its subsidiary for discriminatory treatment based on disability where the corporate veil of the parent is not able to be pierced under either the "instrumentality" or "identity" rule; (2) successor liability does not attach to a company that purchased all of the assets of a predecessor company through a purchase agreement that specifically did not assume any liabilities and therefore said "successor" company is dismissed; and (3) a motion for stay is not granted based on the outcome of a pending declaratory ruling before the commission because the ruling has no more weight than a decision in a contested case proceeding and the timeliness of the outcome is uncertain.

Electric Boat Corporation, Berzeda Massa v.
9840265
Manzione, 3/6/00

Ruling on motion in limine. Held*:* Once a complaint is certified to public hearing, it is viewed as a whole. Therefore, all allegations within it are the subject of the public hearing regardless of whether reasonable cause was found or conciliation attempted and failed with respect to each allegation within the complaint. (Note: A copy of the ruling is available by contacting the Office of Public Hearings.)

Engelhard, Edith, Angela Pinto v.
0550113
Kerr, 5/3/07

Final decision. The complainant alleged that she was discriminated against in being denied rental housing on the basis of her section 8 source of income, in violation of General Statutes § 46a-64c (a) (1). The respondent alleged that the denial was based on unsatisfactory credit and failing to comply with her last minute demand that the complainant provide proof of good funds for first month's rent and security two days prior to the lease inception. It was found that there was evidence of the respondent having stated that the cause of the rejection was her husband's refusal to accept the governmental involvement (in the form of section 8 paperwork and including submission of IRS form W-9) section 8 participation requires. This conclusion was supported by several exhibits (some executed by both parties), which confirmed a meeting of the minds on all rental details. The *Price Waterhouse* model was applied and it was found that the respondent did not meet her burden of establishing that she would have denied the complainant rental housing even in the absence of the complainant's section 8 source of income. The complainant was awarded $5,000 for emotional distress and an attorney's fee award was made in the amount of $10,500.

Environmental Protection, Dept. of, V.R. Reddi Pingle v.
9910114
FitzGerald, 2/1/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated at the end of his probationary period because of his national origin, color, and ancestry. Held*:* (1) the complainant offered no direct evidence of discriminatory motivation; (2) the complainant also did not show, under the McDonnell Douglas-Burdine analysis that he was qualified for the position, circumstances giving rise to an inference of discrimination, or that the respondent's articulated legitimate business reason was a pretext for discrimination or otherwise lacking in credibility.

Environmental Protection, Dept. of, Ann D. Weichman v.
0710348
Wilkerson Brillant, 05/19/09

Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent failed to accommodate her disability, subjected her to unequal terms and conditions of employment and terminated her because of her physical disability and her age in violation of General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a), 46a-60 (a) (1), 46a-70, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) and the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). The respondent moved to dismiss the complaint arguing this tribunal lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the doctrine of sovereign immunity bars the state claims, the § 46a-70 claim applies to named state officials, and that § 46a-58 (a) did not cover the federal claims. Ruling: The complainant's state claims fall within the exceptions of §§ 4-142 (2) and (3), and § 46a-70 applies to employment discrimination in state agencies where no individual state officials are named defendants. The complainant's ADA and Title VII claims are covered under § 46a-58 (a), but age is not a protected class under § 46a-58 (a) and therefore complainant's ADEA claim is dismissed.

Esposito Design Associates, Inc., Tracy A. Standard v.
0820445
FitzGerald, 06/28/10

Objection to defendant corporation proceeding pro se overruled. When the attorney for the respondent corporation withdrew its appearance, the non-lawyer officer of the corporation filed notice that he would be proceeding on behalf of the corporation. The commission's objection to the respondent appearing pro se is overruled as the commission's regulations permit a respondent to appear pro se in an administrative proceeding.

F&L, Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse Restaurant, Diana Lee Brelig v.
9540683
Wilkerson, 2/2/00

Hearing in damages. Former waitress awarded: (1) Back pay in the amount of $37,616.08; and (2) Prejudgment interest in the amount of $3,419.64.

Fairfield, Town of, Orlando Callado v.
9420437
FitzGerald, 10/15/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of age in denying him participation in its pension plan.

Fairfield, Town of, v. Rose Ann Carlson
0620142
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

The respondent's "motion to preclude relitigation of factual findings in *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* and to preclude relitigation of certain legal issues as a result of the *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* decision" is denied. The respondent argued that the doctrine of collateral estoppel should apply so as to preclude the relitigation of the factual and legal findings determined in connection with the final decision issued in *O'Halloran*. Collateral estoppel is inapplicable for at least three reasons. First, the presiding referee concluded that O'Halloran did not prove discrimination; he did not conclude that the respondent did not discriminate. Second, in *O'Halloran*, the presiding referee specifically noted that: he did not intend his findings in *O'Halloran* to be applied to the merits of this case. Finally, under the facts of this case, the policies underlying collateral estoppel and the anti-discrimination statutes favor not applying collateral estoppel.

Fairfield, Town of, v. Rose Ann Carlson
0620142
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine is granted to preclude evidence of qualifications unknown to the decision-maker at the time of the hiring decision. Under the "after-acquired evidence" doctrine, information that was unknown to the decision-maker at the time he made his decision could not have influenced his decision and, therefore, is irrelevant as to his motivation in choosing whom to hire.

Fairfield, Town of, v. Rose Ann Carlson
0620142
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine seeking to preclude the introduction of evidence regarding any emotional distress damages is denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it refused to hire her for the position of zoning inspector because of her sex. Although emotional distress damages are not available for a violation of § 46a-60, the complainant's damage claims also arise from the respondent's alleged unlawful practices under Title VII, which would constitute a violation of § 46a-58 (a) and afford the complainant the relief, including emotional distress damages, available under General Statute § 46a-86 (c).

Fairfield, Town of, Rose Ann Carlson v.
0620142
FitzGerald, 07/10/09

Motion for reconsideration of the ruling sustaining the respondent's in limine objection to the testimony of Josephine O'Halloran is denied. First, as proffered by the commission, O'Halloran's proposed testimony offered no obvious or logical connection to the issue of the respondent's alleged discriminatory conduct toward the complainant. Second, O'Halloran is not a "similarly situated" witness. Third, the commission provided no specific as to the discriminatory treatment of the complainant that O'Halloran personally observed and also provided no specific information as to what testimony O'Halloran could corroborate that would both need corroboration and also not be unduly repetitious.

Fairfield, Town of, Betty Gabriel v.
0620141
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

The respondent's "motion to preclude relitigation of factual findings in *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* and to preclude relitigation of certain legal issues as a result of the *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* decision" is denied. The respondent argued that the doctrine of collateral estoppel should apply so as to preclude the relitigation of the factual and legal findings determined in connection with the final decision issued in *O'Halloran*. Collateral estoppel is inapplicable for at least three reasons. First, the presiding referee concluded that O'Halloran did not prove discrimination; he did not conclude that the respondent did not discriminate. Second, in *O'Halloran*, the presiding referee specifically noted that: he did not intend his findings in *O'Halloran* to be applied to the merits of this case. Finally, under the facts of this case, the policies underlying collateral estoppel and the anti-discrimination statutes favor not applying collateral estoppel.

Fairfield, Town of, Betty Gabriel v.
0620141
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine is granted to preclude evidence of qualifications unknown to the decision-maker at the time of the hiring decision. Under the "after-acquired evidence" doctrine, information that was unknown to the decision-maker at the time he made his decision could not have influenced his decision and, therefore, is irrelevant as to his motivation in choosing whom to hire.

Fairfield, Town of, Betty Gabriel v.
0620141
FitzGerald, 06/30/09

Motion in limine seeking to preclude the introduction of evidence regarding any emotional distress damages is denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it refused to hire her for the position of zoning inspector because of her sex. Although emotional distress damages are not available for a violation of § 46a-60, the complainant's damage claims also arise from the respondent's alleged unlawful practices under Title VII, which would constitute a violation of § 46a-58 (a) and afford the complainant the relief, including emotional distress damages, available under General Statute § 46a-86 (c).

Fairfield, Town of, Betty Gabriel v.
0620141
FitzGerald, 07/10/09

Motion for reconsideration of the ruling sustaining the respondent's in limine objection to the testimony of Josephine O'Halloran is denied. First, as proffered by the commission, O'Halloran's proposed testimony offered no obvious or logical connection to the issue of the respondent's alleged discriminatory conduct toward the complainant. Second, O'Halloran is not a "similarly situated" witness. Third, the commission provided no specific as to the discriminatory treatment of the complainant that O'Halloran personally observed and also provided no specific information as to what testimony O'Halloran could corroborate that would both need corroboration and also not be unduly repetitious.

Fairfield, Town of, Rose Ann Carlson v.
0620142
FitzGerald, 12/28/09

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant was one of four applicants (three females and one male) for the position of zoning inspector. The respondent hired the male applicant for the position. The complainant alleged that she was not hired because of her sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the

respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of her sex when it did not hire her for the position of zoning inspector.

Fairfield, Town of, Betty Gabriel v.
0620141
FitzGerald, 12/28/09

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant was one of four applicants (three females and one male) for the position of zoning inspector. The respondent hired the male applicant for the position. The complainant alleged that she was not hired because of her sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of her sex when it did not hire her for the position of zoning inspector.

Fairfield, Town of, Josephine O'Halloran v
0620146
(appeal dismissed)
Austin, 5/20/08

Final Decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that she was denied a promotion for the position of zoning inspector as a consequence of her gender. She further alleged that the respondent failed to follow the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Held: The complainant failed to present a prima facie case in that she failed to satisfy the element that she was qualified for the position. Further, even if the complainant had sustained her burden of being qualified, she was not the best candidate in the field of three females and one male. As to the complainant's claims that the CBA was not followed, no credible evidence was submitted to believe that the respondent used the complainant's gender in determining how to interpret the CBA.

Frenzilli, Nancy & Ralph, Deborah & Raymond Aguiar v.
9850105
Wilkerson, 1/14/00

Hearing in damages. The complainants attempted to rent a home from the respondents and the respondents would not allow the complainants to rent because they had small children. Discrimination based on family status. Award for emotional distress damages of $7,500 to the complainant wife and $3,500 to the complainant husband both with 10% post-judgment interest. Also awarded Attorney's fees of $8,236.25.

Frenzilli, Nancy & Ralph, Deborah & Raymond Aguiar v.
9850105
FitzGerald, 4/22/02 (on remand)

Motion to set aside default Denied with a hearing in damages to be scheduled. Following the entry of a default and a hearing in damages, the commission and complainant brought an enforcement action in Superior Court. The case was remanded with instructions to hold a

hearing on setting aside the default and a hearing in damages. The respondents lacked both a good defense and/or reasonable cause for failure to timely raise their defense.

Germania Lodge, Cheryl Roberts v.
0640147
Wilkerson Brillant, 12/29/08

The complainant's motion to amend the complaint to add a respondent: denied without prejudice: Held: The named respondent, Germania Lodge, the employer, is separate and distinct from Germania Lodge, the membership organization that is a subordinate of the Order of Hermann's Sons. The complainant did not establish that the entity to be added as a respondent, Order of Hermann's Sons, met the criteria of the identity or instrumentality rules in order to pierce the corporate veil. There was no evidence that the Order of Hermann's Sons had control over the employer, Germania Lodge's finances and employment policies and/or business practices. Also, there was no evidence that there existed a unity of interest and ownership for the Order of Hermann's Sons and Germania Lodge as an employer. The evidence showed that as an employer, Germania Lodge is an independent entity with separate funds and policies to conduct its employment operations.

Germania Lodge, Cheryl Roberts v.
0640147
Wilkerson Brillant, 03/03/09

Motion to amend granted; allegation of retaliation dismissed. The complainant alleged in her original complaint that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-60 (a) (1) and 46a-58 (a) when it discriminated against her because of her sex when it terminated her employment and denied her membership in its social club. She also alleged the respondent retaliated against her by terminating her because she applied for membership in its social club. The complainant requested that her complaint be amended to add violations of §§ 46a-63 and 46a-64 (a) (public accommodation and she also identified that the respondent as Germania Lodge. The respondent argued that the public accommodation claim had not been fully investigated prior to certification of the complaint and therefore its due process rights would be violated if the amendment were granted. The complaint had originally been dismissed by the investigator's finding of no reasonable cause which did include limited findings on the public accommodation issue. The complainant's reconsideration request was granted and the executive director's decision on reconsideration directed further investigations on the public accommodation claim. Subsequently, the investigator issued a finding of reasonable cause on the complainant's termination, public accommodation and retaliation claims.

Held*:* Because the claim of public accommodation discrimination was alleged in the original complaint and had been investigated and because there was, after reconsideration, a finding of reasonable cause on the entire complaint, the respondent was fully aware of the public accommodation discrimination claim. More importantly, the public hearing process is not to be used as an appeal of the investigator's processing of the complaint pursuant to Section 46a-84 (b). Therefore, the motion to amend is granted allowing the public

accommodation claim. However, the complainant's retaliation claim is dismissed because her allegation that the respondent retaliated against her because she applied for membership in the respondent's social club is not protected activity pursuant to § 46a-60 (a) (4).

Germania Lodge, Cheryl Roberts v.
0640147
Wilkerson Brillant, 07/01/09

Motion for sanctions granted in part, denied in part. The respondent moved for sanctions against the complainant for her failure to produce documents as ordered. The respondent was seeking documents, specifically income tax returns, pertaining to the complainant's damages calculation including her earned income from the respondent's employ and her mitigation obligation. The complainant had provided inconsistent reasons for not providing the documents as ordered. The commission and the complainant were precluded from introducing any evidence related to the complainant's income tax returns or relevant income information.

Glastonbury Fire Dept., Town of, Kirk McKinney v.
1140156
Wilson, 01/16/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated General Statutes section 46a-60(a)(1), 46a-64(a)(1), 46a-74 and 46a-76 when it refused him to retain his position as deputy chief because he had turned 66 years old. *Held*: General Statute Section 46a-60(b)(1)(C) creates a statutory exclusion from the age discrimination protections found in section 46a-60(a) for firefighters. Further, that prohibitions against discrimination in access to and enjoyment of public accommodations, pursuant to section 46a-64 to not extend to employment by any enterprise defined, pursuant to section 46a-63(1) to be a place of public accommodation. Employment discrimination by places of public accommodation, resort or amusement are regulated by sections 46a-58m 46a-60 and 46a-81c.

Gnat, Czeslaw, Malisa McNeal-Morris v.
9950108
Knishkowy, 1/4/00

Hearing in damages. After the complainant negotiated purchase of residential property from the respondent landowner, the respondent changed his mind several times, resulting in a series of postponements for the closing. More than two months after the original closing date, the respondent decided he would not sell to complainant at all. The respondent's liability established by order of default. After hearing in damages, complainant awarded: (1) economic damages for various expenses needlessly incurred in preparation for the closing and move ($3,995), and (2) emotional distress damages ($6,500).

Gorski, Andrew & Hanna, Ricky & Regina Cooper v.
9710196, 9710197
Allen, 1/5/01

Remand decision. Judgment for the complainants. Held*:* The respondents discriminated against the complainants with respect to the terms and conditions of a prospective rental by requiring additional and more comprehensive credit, employment, and educational background information than was required of white tenants. The complainants are awarded $5,000.00 in damages for emotional distress.

Gorski, Andrew & Hanna, Ricky & Regina Cooper v.
9710196, 9710197
Allen, 1/31/01

Petition for reconsideration granted. The complainants and the commission are granted 30 days to file Motions seeking an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and the respondents shall have 10 days to file objections, if any.

Gorski, Andrew & Hanna, Ricky & Regina Cooper v.
9710196, 9710197
Allen, 4/16/01
(Supplemental)

The complainants were awarded $20,000.00 in attorney's fees for the respondent's discrimination in regard to the terms and conditions associated with the rental of real estate; attorney's fees appropriate even where complainants represented by non-profit Legal Clinic; detailed time sheets sufficient to establish reasonableness of fees requested.

Grace Christian School, Sandra J. Schoen v. 0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)
FitzGerald, 12/02/02

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment, harassed her, and discriminated against her in the terms and conditions of her employment in violation of Title VII and §§ 46a-60(a)(1) and 46a-60(a)(4) in retaliation for her refusal to ask her minister if he was a homosexual. Ruling: the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction because sexual orientation is not an enumerated protected class within Title VII or § 46a-60(a)(1), opposing a discriminatory employment practice is not protected by § 46a-81c, the respondent is exempt under § 46a-81p from § 46a-81c, and/or there is no employment relationship between the respondent and the complainant's minister.

Greenwich Bd of Education, Grace Lohr v.
1220147
Mount, 08/02/2018

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for its decision to terminate the complainant's employment.

Groton Open MRI LLC, Susan Senra v.
1140018
Mount, 11/14/2014

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that she was illegally terminated due to her gender and pregnancy in violation of General Statutes Sections 45a-60a (1) and (7). *Held*: the complainant established that her pregnancy was a motivating factor in her termination. Complainant awarded backpay of $7,945 and pre- and post-judgment interest.

H&H Promotions, Inc., Ashley Hogan v.
1720211
Wright, 09/06/2018

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $12,120 in backpay, $30,000 in emotional distress damages, and post-judgement interest.

Hamilton Standard, James Duarte v.
9610553
Giliberto, 9/30/99

Motion to dismiss denied in part. Held*:* (1) The complainant alleged facts sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of disability discrimination; (2) Employers have a duty under state law to make reasonable accommodations; (3) General Statutes § 46a-58(a) does not apply to discriminatory employment practices that fall under the federal statutes; and (4) The commission does have jurisdiction over federal claims of discrimination.

Hamilton Standard, Fred Sarnecky v.
9910156
Allen, 5/3/00

Motion to recuse denied. The commission sought to recuse referee because Motion to Decertify and supporting brief inadvertently sent to Office of Public Hearings. Held*:* Actual bias needed to be shown to recuse hearing officer and no showing was made, particularly where Referee declined to read the briefs in denying the motion to decertify on its face.

Hamilton Sundstrand Corp., Dominic C. Scarfo v.
9610577
Giliberto, 9/27/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) General Statutes § 46a-58(a) encompasses ADA claims; (2) Human Rights Referees have authority to adjudicate federal claims, including the ADA; (3) Prior adverse arbitration decision is not entitled to receive substantial weight by this tribunal and does not preclude the complainant from receiving remedies; (4) The complainant's state claims of discrimination are not preempted by § 301 of the Labor-Management Relations Act; (5) The respondent did not regard the complainant as disabled under the ADA; (6) The complainant was not entitled to reasonable accommodations under the ADA based on his "regarded as" claim; (7) General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) includes perceived disability claims; (8) The respondent did not perceive the complainant to be disabled under § 46a-60(a)(1); (9) the *McDonnell Douglas* model of analysis applies to the facts in this matter; and (10) There is no duty to provide reasonable accommodations for perceived disability claims under state law.

Hamilton Sundstrand; Robert Bernd (9710052), John Bielanski (9710053), and Richard Perry (9710063) v.
FitzGerald, 01/04/02

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) whether the complainant applied for a position is a question of fact; (2) the public hearing is not an opportunity to challenge the adequacy of precertification investigation; (3) commission has jurisdiction to adjudicate ADEA claims; (4) failure of investigator to comply with "date certain" for issuance of reasonable cause finding pursuant to General Statutes § 46a-82 does not result in the dismissal of the complaint; (5) complaint is not necessarily preempted by Labor Management Act.

Hartford, City of, Mary Haley v.
0010273
(appeal withdrawn)
FitzGerald, 7/1/02

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: (1) The complainant established that she was discriminated against in promotional opportunities on the basis of her race. The respondent's articulated non-discriminatory reason found to be pretextual. The discrimination constituted a continuing violation. The complainant's failure to formally apply for a promotion excused as her application would have been a futile. The complainant is awarded back pay and a promotion retroactive to September 13, 1998. (2) The complainant's claim of discrimination based upon her disability was dismissed.

Hartford, City of, Mary Haley v.
0010273
FitzGerald, 3/12/03

Supplement to final decision. Clarification and itemization of monetary damages.

Hartford, City of, Robert McWeeny v.
0410314
(appeal dismissed)
FitzGerald, 08/02/05

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The respondents paid a pension to the complainant's spouse, a retired city employee. When the complainant's spouse died, the respondents paid a spousal allowance to the complainant, who had never been employed by the respondents. The respondents terminated the spousal allowance upon the complainant's remarriage. The complainant alleged that the termination of the allowance constituted discrimination against him on the basis of his marital status. There was no evidence that the respondents had discriminated against the employed spouse. Held: (1) employee status is a prerequisite to maintaining a complaint of employment discrimination and (2) complaint dismissed because the complainant never had employee status with any of the respondents.

Hartford Fire Dept, City of., John Cooper & John C. Donahue v.
9710685, 9710637
(remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)
Trojanowski, 8/14/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainants did not establish a prima facie case proving that the failure of the respondent to promote them was based on intentional discrimination due to their race and gender. The complainants also failed to establish a prima facie case proving that the respondent retaliated against them for the exercise of their rights under Title VII and CFEPA. After appeal, decision was remanded. On remand, judgment for commission and complainant Donahue with relief as set forth in the decision.

Hartford Fire Dept., City of, John Cooper & John C. Donahue v.
9710685, 9710637
Trojanowski, 9/7/00

Petition for reconsideration denied. The commission filed a petition for reconsideration citing the existence of a "valid settlement agreement" as its good cause. The respondent filed an objection based on the fact that although there was a proposed agreement between counsel, the agreement had not been approved by the Hartford City Council, the only authority authorized by the City Charter to approve settlements proposed by the Corporation Counsel. When the final decision was rendered, the City Council had not acted to finalize the agreement. Thus, the proposed settlement was invalidated because the decision came out before the Council had acted.

Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc., Carla Bray-Faulks v.
0210354
FitzGerald, 05/25/04

The respondent's motion to dismiss is denied and the complaint is remanded to the investigator to attempt conciliation. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss the complaint in its entirety because the investigator did not attempt conciliation prior to her certification of the complaint. The respondent claimed that § 46a-83(f) mandates that an investigator attempt conciliation, and that the investigator's failure in this case to attempt conciliation resulted in the commission losing subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint. Held: (1) an attempt to conciliate is mandatory under § 46a-83(f), (2) this statutory requirement to attempt conciliation is a condition precedent to certification and public hearing, not an issue of subject matter jurisdiction; and (3) because subject matter jurisdiction is not lost if the attempt at conciliation is held more than 50 days after a finding of reasonable cause [see § 46a-82e(a)], the complaint is remanded to the investigator to attempt conciliation, and, if conciliation is unsuccessful, to then certify the complaint for public hearing. As the complaint is being remanded, the respondent's arguments to dismiss portions of the complaint as untimely need not be addressed at this time.

Hartford Housing Authority, Frank Secondo v.
9710713
Knishkowy, 6/9/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) Entire complaint, as certified, properly before human rights referee, even though commission investigator found no reasonable cause on several of the allegations. (2) Because the respondent chose not to re-fill vacant foreman position in 1997, the complainant did not prove that the respondent's failure to promote him to foreman was motivated by his physical disabilities. Even if the respondent had filled the position, the complainant was not qualified. (3) The respondent did not harass the complainant because of his disabilities. (4) The respondent did not deny overtime opportunities to the complainant because of his disabilities. (5) The respondent did not unlawfully withhold reasonable accommodations from the complainant. For some time, the complainant was able to perform the essential functions of his job without need for reasonable accommodations. After a work-related injury, there were no reasonable accommodations that would allow the complainant to perform the essential functions. (6) The respondent did not retaliate against the complainant for challenging promotional decisions made in 1995 and 1997.

Hartford Police Dept., City of., Dana Peterson v.
0410049
Austin, 11/14/08

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged she was discriminated against as a consequence of her gender and disabilities (transsexual/physical and mental/gender dysphoria disorder). She further alleged that as a consequence of her having previously opposed an alleged discriminatory employment practice she was retaliated against by the respondent. Held: The complainant and commission failed to establish a prima facie case under the pretext model of analysis on most of the complainant's claims. As to the claims where the complainant successfully presented a prima facie case the legitimate business reason produced by the respondent for its decision was not proven to be a pretext for discrimination.

Hartford Police Dept., City of, Khoa Phan v.
1210181 (appeal pending)
Mount, 03/04/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent illegally discriminated against him when it terminated him from his position as a probationary police office because of his ancestry. The complainant was awarded $210,596 in backpay; $25,000 in emotional distress damages; and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Hartford Public Schools, Rosemarie Gill v.
0010417
Knishkowy, 2/14/02

Ruling on interrogatories. Held*:* Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production/disclosure of documents.

Hartford Public Schools, Stephan Carretero v.
0310481
Knishkowy, 11/28/05

Two-part motion for "Summary Disposition" denied. The complainant filed his initial complaint alleging that the non-renewal of his teaching contract was motivated by discrimination; in his amended complaint, he claimed that the respondent's refusal to replace the termination notice in his personnel file with a resignation letter was in retaliation for his initial complaint. Held*:* (1) the respondent's claim that complainant failed to exhaust administrative remedies raises a jurisdictional issue and thus is treated as motion to dismiss. The exhaustion doctrine applies when a party brings a complaint to the superior court without exhausting administrative remedies. In this case, the doctrine is not applicable; there is no legal justification, explicit or otherwise, or convincing policy argument for a complainant to exhaust remedies under Teacher Tenure Act (§10-151) before bringing a discriminatory termination claim to the CHRO. (2) The respondent also argues that the complainant has not

demonstrated that he suffered an adverse employment action, and that allowing the complainant to substitute a resignation letter at this time would compromise the respondent's ability to defend against the initial claim. Whether the complainant suffered an adverse employment action is an issue of material fact whose resolution is premature without further evidence. While the legal defense argument has been recognized as valid by various court decisions, in this case further evidence is needed before this tribunal can rule conclusively, especially in light of allegation that the respondent stated that its refusal to change the personnel file was due to the filing of the initial complaint.

Hartford Public Schools, Sandra Baker v.
1310147
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Motion to dismiss. Motion granted in part and denied in part. *Held:* motion granted as to the Section 46a-58(a) claim seeking to enforce Title VII, the 46a-64(a) claim and the 46a-75 claim. Motion denied as to the 46a-58(a) claim seeking to enforce General Statute 10-15c.

Hartford Roofing Co., Paula DeBarros v.
0430162
Trojanowski, 05/10/05

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged sexual harassment because of her sex and constructive discharge because of the harassment. The complainant was awarded back pay of $15,223.30; health insurance benefits of $8,254.82, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

H.E.R.E. Local 217, David Joiner v.
0410177
Austin, 07/21/06

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent, his union, denied him representation and also aided and abetted his employer in denying him seniority rights he was entitled to under the collective bargaining agreement. Because resolution of the merits of the complaint would have required interpreting the collective bargaining agreement, the complaint was dismissed as preempted by § 301 of the federal Labor and Management Relations Act.

Home & Life Security, Inc., Ira Ratner v.
9930246
Manzione, 5/12/00

Motion to dismiss granted due to failure to cooperate. The complainant, who was represented by counsel, failed to comply with multiple orders. The complainant, himself, failed to attend a settlement conference without excuse or permission. The complainant also failed to file and serve a settlement conference report, failed to produce documents in compliance with a ruling on a motion to compel, filed to file and serve exhibit and witness lists, failed to bring exhibits to the prehearing conference and failed to return opposing counsel’s telephone calls.

Held*:* the human rights referee has authority to dismiss complaints pursuant to § 46a-54-101 of the Regulations. Also, the nature of the relationship between the attorney and his client is one of traditional agency. The acts of an attorney are ordinarily attributed to his client. Therefore, the severe inaction of the complainant or his attorney warrants dismissal of the complaint.

Hospital for Special Care, Edwin Navarro v.
9710678
Allen, 3/14/03

Final decision. The complainant alleged wrongful termination based on race, color, and gender, and discrimination based on disability alleged to be ADHD and learning disability; HELD: 1. Insufficient evidence presented to establish even prima facie case based on race, color or gender; 2. The complainant failed to show he was disabled according to law and thus prima facie case not established; 3. Alternatively, even assuming a prima facie case, the weight of evidence established that discharge was based on legitimate performance grounds and were not based on disability notwithstanding some credibility problems with the respondent's testimony; 4. The complainant did not properly allege a failure to accommodate claim which was asserted in its brief and in any event there was no evidence to support such a claim.

Ice Cream Delight, Jane Doe (1993) v.
9310191
Trojanowski, 9/1/99

Hearing in damages. Part-time yogurt store worker who was sexually harassed and terminated requested monetary damages consisting of back pay, front pay and compound interest. Held*:* (1) the complainant is entitled to two years back pay which terminated when she obtained a higher paying job; (2) the complainant not entitled to front pay because she was made whole economically by the award of back pay; (3) the awarding of interest and whether it is compounded is in the discretion of the presiding human rights referee. Compound pre-judgment interest awarded on the award of backpay from the date of the discriminatory act; (4) statutory post-judgment interest; and (5) Various equitable remedies.

Imagineers, LLC, Edward J. Carey v.
9850104
Wilkerson, 9/2/99

Motion to stay denied. The commission moved for stay of the proceedings because the complainant had filed an action in federal court. The complainant joined and the respondent did not object. Held*:* Res judicata and collateral estoppel are not valid reasons to grant a stay of proceedings, no duplication of efforts, no unnecessary costs, and discovery by the commission may be used to effect discovery in the federal action. No plausible reason existed to grant stay of proceedings.

International Athletic Association of Basketball Officials, Lou Volpintesta v.
9910120
Giliberto, 7/29/99

Hearing in damages. Part-time high school basketball referee awarded: (1) back pay (2) front pay (3) membership dues; (4) various equitable remedies.

Jackson, Arlette, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson
0750001, 0750002
Knishkowy, 07/03/07

Ruling on request for production. Held: Notwithstanding the caption of this document, the respondent's pleading is, de facto, a set of interrogatories. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the commission regulations to requests for production. Absent express authorization, interrogatories are impermissible.

Jackson, Arlette, Johnmark & Clarissa Brown v.
0750001, 0750002
Knishkowy, 11/17/08

Final decision. Judgment for complainants. Complainants husband and wife rented apartment from the respondent landlord. When husband lost his job after several months, he applied for rental subsidy. The respondent landlord refused to complete the requisite forms and husband ultimately could not complete his application to obtain the subsidy. The respondent offered myriad reasons for her refusal, many inherently inconsistent or simply not credible. Held: given liberal reading of fair housing statutes, and following logic of other cases, thwarting the complainant's ability to obtain subsidy is not meaningfully different than outright refusing to accept lawful subsidy. The landlord violated §46a-64c(a)(2). After refusing to help husband, the landlord engaged in a two month period of severe harassment of both complainants. Held: landlord's egregious, severe and pervasive actions and provocations were in retaliation for husband's attempt to obtain subsidy, and they created a hostile housing environment, violating both §§ 46a-64c(a)(2) and 46a-64c(a)(9).

Jemison, Robert, Juliet Scott v.
9950020
FitzGerald, 3/20/00

Hearing in damages. The complainant's motion for default for failure to file an answer was granted. The respondent's motions to dismiss and set aside default were denied. Case proceeded to a hearing in damages. The complainant was awarded $6,000 for emotional distress and $25,296.44 for attorney's fees and costs. The complainant alleged her landlord physically and verbally assaulted and harassed her, denied her equal services, and threatened her with eviction in violation of General Statutes § 46a-64c(a)(2) and (3) on the basis of her race and color. She also alleged retaliation for the filing of her complaint in violation of § 46a-60(a)(4).

Jensen, Chad, Kimberly Lawton v.
0550135
Austin, 10/18/07

Hearing in damages: The complainant who was harassed due to her race and color by a teenage neighbor brought an action under state and federal fair housing laws. The complainant was awarded damages for emotional distress, lost wages, and attorney's fees. The complainant's claims for damages against the teenager's mother pursuant to General Statutes § 52-572 and common law negligent supervisor were not allowed.

John Brown Engineers & Construction, Inc., Inessa Slootskin v.
9320167
FitzGerald, 4/29/03

Final decision after remand. The final decision was issued by the hearing officer in 1999. On appeal, the matter was remanded as to damages. On remand, the case was reassigned to a human rights referee who awarded front pay, prejudgment and post-judgment interest, and additional back pay and fringe benefits.

Johnny's Pizza, Patricia Nicolosi v.
9840466
Giliberto, 10/26/99

Complaint dismissed due to the complainant's failure to cooperate. Pro se complainant failed to attend scheduling conference and settlement conference without excuse or explanation.

Judicial Department, State of Connecticut, Roberts Latef v.
1030184
Wilson, 06/13/2014

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. *Held*: evidence presented failed to establish that the respondent articulated reason for failing to hire the complainant as a permanent employee at the end of his probation period, because he had not acquired the necessary skills, was a pretext for discrimination.

J.P. Dempsey's, Eileen O'Neill v.
9430534
Knishkowy, 6/11/99

Ruling on interrogatories. Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery limited by Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis, Felix Planas
1210127
Bromley, 05/21/2014

Disability, reasonable accommodation, reinstatement, retaliation, sovereign immunity

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant in part and for the respondent in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent (1) discriminated against him by failing to engage in an interactive process to accommodate his physical disability; (2) discriminated against him and terminated his employment because of his disability; and (3) terminated his employment in retaliation for requesting reasonable accommodations and rejecting a non-equivalent job offer. *Held*: judgment entered in favor of the complainant on the claim that the respondent failed to reasonably accommodate his disability. The complainant demonstrated that the respondent failed to engage in the interactive process and denied him reasonable accommodations on the basis of his disability. Judgment in favor of the respondent on the discrimination and retaliation claims. The respondent was ordered to hire the complainant for the next available principal analyst or equivalent position; pay the complainant backpay in the amount of $177,958.11; pay the state $19,950 as reimbursement for unemployment compensation benefits paid to the complainant; pay the complainant pre- and post-judgment interest; and reimburse the complainant $17,508.60 in medical expenses.

Kelly Services, C. Kostas and Covidien LP dba Covidien, Carnell Artis v.
1230079 (1230080, 1230184)
Wilson, 12/07/2015

Motion for directed verdict following the presentation of the complainant's case granted. The complainant filed three complainants alleging race and age discrimination, retaliation, and aiding and abetting. Following one day of trial, the respondent moved for a directed verdict on the grounds that the complainant submitted no evidence of discriminatory animus. *Held*: motion granted pursuant to Regulation 46a-54-78a (4) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

La Casona Restaurant, Jocelin Correa v.
0710004
Wilkerson, 04/28/08

Hearing in damages. Held: Pursuant to the default order, the respondents were liable for discriminating against the complainant because of her pregnancy when they discharged her from employment. The complainant was awarded $19,404.88 for back pay, 10% pre-judgment interest of $1940.49, $2500 in emotional distress damages and post judgment interest of 10% per annum from the date of the final decision. The discriminatory act was not done in public and was not highly egregious; the emotional distress was not long in duration; and the consequences of the discrimination were not found to be directly linked to the discriminatory act. The respondent was ordered to cease and desist from discriminatory

practices, not to retaliate against the complainant and to post the commission's antidiscrimination posters in its workplace.

L.G. Defelice, Inc., Guy Recupero v.
0530022
Kerr, 4/10/08

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon unlawful dismissal based upon mental disability (bipolar disorder). After hearing held damages awarded under CFEPA in the amount of $164,059.93, plus prejudgment interest, post judgment interest and $12,703 in reimbursement of unemployment compensation payments received. Request for front pay award denied.

Landry, Margaret, dba Superior Agency, Tina Saddler v.
0450057
Knishkowy, 5/23/06

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant proved that the respondent, a real estate broker, denied her an apartment because of her lawful source of income (Section 8 assistance), in violation of § 46a-64c.

Lawrence Crest Cooperative, Inc., Catherine Weller-Bajrami v.
99500095, 9950096
Trojanowski, 8/28/01

Hearing in damages. Claim by a tenant of the respondent and her children that they were discriminated against because of her race, white, her sex, female, and her physical disability, chronic ulcerative colitis. The complainant’s children were not awarded any damages. The complainant was awarded the following types of damages: security deposits, moving costs, rent differentials, the cost of alternative housing, utility (electric bill) differentials, $20,000 for her emotional distress and $6,562 for attorney’s fees.

Lee, Tony d/b/a Better Built Transmissions, Alex Smith v.
0130212
FitzGerald, 7/27/01

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged racial discrimination by his employer resulting in disparate treatment, hostile work environment, and constructive discharge. The complainant awarded $48,496 in back pay and front pay, together with prejudgment and postjudgment compounded interest.

Lighthouse Inn, Jennifer Swindell v.
0840137
Kerr, 1/29/09

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in an employment case claiming retaliation and termination on the basis of race (African-American) and having opposed discrimination. The complainant awarded back pay ($8,000), emotional distress ($1,000) and prejudgment and postjugment interest.

Lowe's Home Centers, Inc., Michael Baker v.
0430307
FitzGerald, 11/18/05

Motion to amend the complaint to add claims of retaliation and national origin discrimination Denied. The complaint alleged that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his age. The allegations of retaliation and national origin discrimination had not been alleged in the complaint, investigated by the commission during or raised by the complainant during the pre-certification factfinding investigation, or supported by any factual findings in the reasonable cause finding. The motion is denied because the requirement under § 46a-83, that the investigator list the factual findings on whether there is reasonable cause to believe that retaliation and national origin discrimination occurred, is a condition precedent to a hearing on those allegations.

Lowe's Home Centers, Inc., Michael Baker v.
0430307
FitzGerald, 01/23/06

Motion to compel denied for failure to articulate an explanation of how the requested documents were relevant and material to the facts of the case.

Lowe's Home Centers, Inc., Michael Baker v.
0430307
FitzGerald, 01/23/06

Motion to compel denied. The respondent's requested documents to contest the commission's finding of reasonable cause. However, the public hearing is a hearing on the merits and not an appeal of the commission's pre-certification processing of the complaint. General Statutes § 46a-84 (b).

Lutkowski, Debra and Paul Pixbey, Gloria Jackson v.
0950094 & 0950095
Austin, 5/25/10

Hearing in Damages. The complainant had alleged that she was harassed due to her race and color by her neighbors (the respondents). The complainant was awarded damages for

emotional distress (anxiety along with loss of weight and sleep) and for damage caused to her car.

Maharam Fabric Corp., Barbara DuBois v.
0920414 (1120319)
Wilson, 07/03/2013

Motion to dismiss the General Statute Section 46a-58 is granted. The complainant alleges in part that the respondent discriminated against her on the basis of her age in violation of General Statute Section 46a-60(a)(1), and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act as enforced through General Statute Section 46a-58. Age is not one of the enumerated protected classes in Section 46a-58.

Maharam Fabric Corp., Barbara DuBois v.
0920414 (1120319)
Wilson, 07/15/2013

Respondent's motion to dismiss the Section 46a-60 claims for lack of jurisdiction is denied because at the time of the filing of the complaint the respondent had at least three employees of whom at least one was employed in Connecticut.

Maharam Fabric Corp., Barbara DuBois v.
0920414
Wilson, 09/19/2014

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant filed two complaints, 0920414 and 1120319, in which she alleged in her first complaint that illegally terminated her employment because of her age and, in her second complaint, later refused to hire her in retaliation for her filing of the first complaint. *Held*: there was insufficient evidence to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reasons for the actions it took.
Mama Bears LLC, Keith Davis v.
0430103
FitzGerald, 08/29/05

Motion to amend the complaint to add a respondent denied without prejudice because there was no verification that the motion and proposed amendment had been received by the proposed respondent. As a matter of due process, the proposed respondent is entitled to notice and opportunity to be heard on the motion.

Mediplex of Greater Hartford, Benjamin Uel v.
9910193
Knishkowy, 9/8/00

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* Under certain circumstances, as in this case, a prior arbitration award adverse to the complainant does not bar the complainant from bringing a

subsequent action with the commission and has no preclusive effect on the facts and issues raised therein.

Mental Health & Addiction Services, Dept. of, Meredith Payton v.
0220396
FitzGerald, 6/8/04

Motion in limine denied for failure to explain its legal position and to provide supporting documentation and affidavits.

Mental Health & Addiction Services, Dept. of, Frederica Dako-Smith v.
0020228 & 0220142
(appeal dismissed)
Austin, 04/12/07

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. African-American complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her by subjecting her to disparate treatment and a hostile work environment. In Case No. 0220142 the complainant alleged as a result of her filing with CHRO the respondent retaliated against her by filing a complaint with the Connecticut Department of Health. Held: The complainant failed to sustain her burden of proving a prima facie case in both complaints as to claims of discrimination and retaliation. (Transcript of decision)

Mental Health & Addiction Services, Dept. of, Meredith Payton v.
0220394
FitzGerald, 7/6/06

The respondent's motion to dismiss, instead treated where appropriate as a motion for summary judgment and a motion to strike, granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against him on the basis of religion. The complainant did not establish an adverse employment action or that similarly situated co-workers were being treated differently. The complainant's proposed relief would have required the respondent to violate the Establishment Clauses of the federal and state constitutions.

Mental Health & Addiction Services, Dept. of, Patricia Robinson v.
0630292
Knishkowy, 3/26/08

Ruling on motion to dismiss: The motion to dismiss is denied with one exception. (1) the respondent argued this employment discrimination claim was barred by doctrine of sovereign immunity. The respondent relied upon *Lyon v. Jones*, 104 Conn. App. 547 (2007), cert. granted, 285 Conn. 914 (2008) in support of assertion that this tribunal lacks jurisdiction because the complainant did not obtain permission to sue from the state claims commissioner. The respondent erred because General Statutes § 4-142 exempts from the claims commissioner's purview "claims for which an administrative hearing procedure otherwise is established by law." The CHRO administrative process for discrimination claims

is precisely the type envisioned here. (2) The respondent also incorrectly claimed that this tribunal has no jurisdiction over federal claims. Case law has clarified that General Statutes § 46a-58 (a) expressly converts a violation of federal antidiscrimination law into a violation of Connecticut antidiscrimination laws. § 46a-58 (a) does not include "age" as one of the listed protected classes, so the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act cannot be raised via 46a-58 (a) and must be dismissed. The complainant's federal race, color, physical disability, and retaliation claims remain viable through 46a-58 (a).

Mental Retardation, Dept. of, Salvatore Feroleto v.
0510140
Knishkowy, 8/27/07

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent employer moved to dismiss complaint (or portions thereof) as untimely because some of the alleged discriminatory acts occurred beyond the statutory filing period. The filing requirement is not jurisdictional, but is like a statute of limitations, with which one must comply absent factors such as waiver, consent or equitable tolling. (1) Although untimely discrete acts may be barred even if they are related to timely acts, the vaguely-asserted allegations in the complaint lack details and pertinent dates; only after further evidence can this tribunal determine which acts fall within, and which beyond, the filing period. (2) Because the complainant alleges ongoing harassment (due to his disability), he is entitled to adduce evidence at trial to demonstrate a hostile work environment, which would toll the filing requirement. (3) The complainant should also be allowed to adduce evidence to show that the other actions alleged in his complaint (e.g., ongoing unequal pay, ongoing denial of reasonable accommodations) constitute a "policy or practice" of discrimination, which might also toll the filing requirement.

Meriden, City of, Laurence Jankowski v.
9730288
FitzGerald, 4/6/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant, a firefighter, alleged a violation of General Statutes § 46a-60(a) on the basis of age (65) when the respondent involuntarily retired him under its mandatory retirement policy. Held*:* The respondent's mandatory retirement age of 65 for its firefighters is a per se statutory bona fide occupational qualification under §§ 7-430 and 46a-60(b)(1)(C). The complaint is dismissed.

Metro-North Railroad Co., Holger Ocana v.
0630645
(appeal dismissed)
FitzGerald, 10/16/08

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) and also Title VII and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act when it failed to promote him because of his age and national origin. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss claiming that the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The respondent argued that it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Metropolitan

Transportation Authority, organized under the laws of the State of New York. As a result of a compact between Connecticut and New York, codified in General Statutes §§ 16-343 and 16-344, the respondent operates a commuter rail service in Connecticut and is exempted by Connecticut's legislature from state regulation, including exemption from Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws.

Held: the respondent is in the business of providing mass transportation and railroad service pursuant to the Connecticut – New York compact and is the beneficiary of the exemption in § 16-344 (a). Its promotion of employees involved in its mass transportation and railroad service is within its routine and normal business operations. Based on the Connecticut Supreme Court's decision in *Greenwich v Connecticut Transportation Authority*, 166 Conn. 337 (1974), the exemption in § 16-344 (a) applies to this case. Therefore, the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction of this claim and the motion to dismiss is granted.

Metro-North Railroad Co., Robert Vidal v.
0630646
(appeal dismissed)
FitzGerald, 10/16/08

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it failed to promote him because of his national origin and color. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss claiming that the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The respondent argued that it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, organized under the laws of the State of New York. As a result of a compact between Connecticut and New York, codified in General Statutes §§ 16-343 and 16-344, the respondent operates a commuter rail service in Connecticut and is exempted by Connecticut's legislature from state regulation, including exemption from Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws.

Held: the respondent is in the business of providing mass transportation and railroad service pursuant to the Connecticut – New York compact and is the beneficiary of the exemption in § 16-344 (a). Its promotion of employees involved in its mass transportation and railroad service is within its routine and normal business operations. Based on the Connecticut Supreme Court's decision in *Greenwich v Connecticut Transportation Authority*, 166 Conn. 337 (1974), the exemption in § 16-344 (a) applies to this case. Therefore, the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction of this claim and the motion to dismiss is granted.

Midstate Medical Center, Cindy Saraceno v.
1130445
Wright, 03/04/2016

Motion to strike. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her when it terminated her employment because of her mental disorder. The respondent moved to strike the complaint on the grounds that the facts as pleaded did not establish that the complainant suffered from a mental disability at the time of her termination and, therefore, fails to state a claim for mental disability discrimination. *Held*: Motion denied. While the

complaint may be poorly drafted, the facts as alleged and those that are necessarily employed disclose the bare essentials to state a claim or which relief can be granted and are sufficient to apprise the opposing party of what is meant to be proved.

Milford Automatics, Inc., John Chilly v.
9830459
Knishkowy, 10/3/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant was terminated from employment when he showed up for work with Bell's palsy. The respondent claimed it terminated the complainant for poor work quality and had been planning to do so for some time. Although the complainant failed to prove that he was disabled under the ADA or CFEPA, he did prove that the respondent regarded him as disabled under CFEPA. The complainant established a strong prima facie case and proved that, under the circumstances of the case, the respondent's proffered reason was unworthy of credence.

M.N.S. Corporation, Robert Williams v.
0010124
Knishkowy, 3/1/01

Hearing in damages. The respondent's liability determined by entry of order of default. Award of back pay made to black employee who was terminated from truck-driving position and subsequently replaced by white driver.

Mortgage Company of America, David Mejias v.
0630076
Knishkowy, 3/22/07

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent deemed liable for national origin discrimination for its treatment (i.e., "terms and conditions of employment") and ultimate constructive discharge of the complainant. Pursuant to §46a-86(b), the referee awarded the complainant $43,214 for back pay and unpaid commissions, along with compounded pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

Mortgage Company of America, Kevin Rhodes v.
0630040
Knishkowy, 3/15/07

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent liable for race discrimination for its treatment (i.e., "terms and conditions of employment") and ultimate termination of the complainant. Pursuant to §46a-86(b) the referee awarded the complainant $33,960 for back pay and unpaid commissions, along with compounded pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

Motor Vehicles, Dept. of, Florence Parker-Bair v.
0510486
Austin, 12/15/09

Motion to dismiss granted. Held: The respondent moved to dismiss complaint's allegations of retaliation for having previously opposed discrimination due to the lack of jurisdiction. The basis for the respondent's motion was that the commission's investigator did not find reasonable cause as to the claim of retaliation. Not only was there no reasonable cause found, the investigator opined that filing with the commission resulted in the complainant's promotion. There being no reasonable cause found to believe that retaliation may have occurred deprives this tribunal of jurisdiction to hear this claim.

Mothers Works, Inc., Alexis Gillmore v
0330195
Trojanowski, 9/30/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant was terminated because of her gender, familial status and her pregnancy. Damages included back pay.

Nailtique aks Nailtique, Inc., Rochelle Toepelt v.
0720118
Wilson, 12/13/2013

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to file an answer in a denial of services case predicated upon disability discrimination. The complainant was awarded $250 in emotional distress damages and $445.76 in damages.

Napoli Motors, Stephen Ceslik v.
0030569, 0030586, 0030587
Knishkowy, 2/15/02

Motion to disqualify opposing counsel denied. Held: The law firm of a lawyer who represented the complainant many years ago now represents the respondents in the present action. The complainant moved to disqualify the firm and its members under Rule 1.9 and 1.10 of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Because the earlier representation bears no "substantial relationship"—in fact, no relationship at all—to the present matter, no violation of the Rules exists.

Napoli Motors, Stephen Ceslik v.
0030569, 0030586, 0030587
Knishkowy, 3/21/02

Motion to strike special defenses granted. The respondent raised two special defenses predicated upon prior findings and determination of the commission investigator as to some of the allegations in the complaint. However, the complaint was certified to hearing in its

entirety, and thus, the referee must conduct a de novo hearing on the entire complaint; the respondent cannot successfully base special defenses solely on the investigator's report.

Naugatuck, Borough of, Roberta A. Dacey v.
8330054
Wilkerson, 8/10/99

Order for relief on remand. Calculation of backpay. Held*:* (1) The complainant vigorously litigated her discrimination claim for damages and is entitled to full amount of backpay; (2) Prejudgment interest is an appropriate element in a backpay award; and (3) Fringe benefits are an appropriate element in a backpay award.

Neil Roberts, Inc, Rosa DiMicco v.
0420438
Kerr, 9/12/06

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon sexual harassment and retaliatory dismissal. The complainant was awarded back pay ($7,220), lost benefits ($3,699), emotional distress ($6,000) and prejudgment interest ($4,740).

Neil Roberts, Inc., Rosa DiMicco v
0420438
Kerr, 11/16/06

Final decision on reconsideration. The complainant requested a reconsideration of the final decision dated September 12, 2006, wherein the referee declined to award attorney's fees because the complainant supplied inadequate documentation to support an award. Held: After granting the motion to reconsider, and reviewing a detailed itemized bill with proposed hourly rates, the referee awarded $10,369.39 in attorney's fees, rejecting the proposed lodestar fee of $17,282.31 as unreasonable and out of proportion with the effort put forth and the result obtained.

NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley, Dawn Wynkoop v.
0840008
Mount, 04/18/2018

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that her employment was terminated because of her age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating her employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

NERAC, Inc., Stephen Warner v.
0840031
Mount, 08/02/2012

Motion to dismiss. The respondent's motion to dismiss contends that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear an age discrimination claim because of the minimum age requirement under the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act, that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear a claim for familial status under Section 46a-60(a)(1) and that ERISA pre-empts jurisdiction of the complainant's health insurance claim. *Held*: the commission has subject matter jurisdiction over age and sex discrimination claims, and the complainant is not asserting a claim directly connected to the health insurance plan.

NERAC and Kevin Bouley, Steven Warner v.
0840031
Mount, 12/13/2012

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated from his employment because of his age and his wife's pregnancy. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating her employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

NERAC and Kevin Bouley, James Brule v.
0840032
Mount, 04/18/2018

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley, Douglas Eitelman
0840162
Mount, 04/18/2018

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley, David Bruce Sloman
0840243
Mount, 04/18/2018

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: The complainant signed a valid release waiving his right to bring this claim. Further, the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

New Britain, City of, Brian Kelly v.
0210359
Trojanowski, 10/18/04

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent argued that (1) the complainant not physically disabled as defined under the ADA, Rehabilitation Act, or § 46a-60(a)(1) and (2) the complaint was barred by the statute of limitations because it was filed more than 180 days after the filing of the complaint. The respondent's first argument is more properly a motion for summary judgment and was treated as such. The motion denied in its entirety.

New Britain, City of , Lynne Kowalczyk v.
9810482
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 3/15/02

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Three public school employees were transferred to other schools because their strained and volatile interpersonal relationships demonstrated a potential for disruption in the school where all three worked. The complainant brought this action against the city, the board of education, and two administrators, alleging that the transfer was based on her mental disability and her sexual orientation. Held: (1) complainant failed to meet her prima facie case for each claim, because her transfer was not an "adverse employment action;" (2) complainant failed to demonstrate, for purposes of her prima facie burden, that she was transferred "because of" her disability; (3) complainant failed to demonstrate, for purposes of her prima facie burden, any circumstances giving rise to an inference of discrimination based on her sexual orientation; (4) individual respondents not liable, as matter of law, under ADA, General Statutes §46a-60(a)(1), or §46a-81c; (5) complainant failed to prove facts showing individual respondents aided or abetted discriminatory practice in violation of §46a-60(a)(5).

New Britain Transportation Co., Stacy Maher v.
0330303
Kerr, 04/17/06

Final decision. Case dismissed. The complainant claimed discrimination as a result of her gender in her rate of pay, being passed over for promotion, being offered a promotion on lesser terms than males, having her hours reduced and being constructively discharged. The complaint was brought under CFEPA, Title Vll and the Equal Pay Act. After full hearing the complaint was dismissed for failure to establish a prima facie case as some allegations did not constitute adverse employment actions and others were under circumstances where no improper animus could be inferred.

New England Stair Co., Mark Demmerle v.
1730020
Wright, 01/03/2019

Motion to dismiss. The complainant alleged that the respondent retaliated against him for his previous filing of an employment discrimination complaint against the respondent, then his employer. The alleged act of retaliation was an email sent to the complainant by the respondent's senior vice president of sales which the complainant found threatening. In its motion to dismiss, the respondent contends that the commission does not have subject matter jurisdiction over post-employment actions involving of a former employee and because the adverse action complained of involved the exercise of protected constitutional or statutory rights and privileges of the respondent. *Held*: motion denied. There is no evidence constitutional rights or privileges implicated in this claim of retaliation and the facts as alleged and those necessarily implied are sufficient to state a cause of action for retaliation.

New Haven, City of, Willie Leslie v.
9830575
Allen, 9/1/99

Hearing in damages. Held*:* (1) Request to suspend hearing denied as being unreasonable after five prior continuances; and (2) the complainant and the commission's failure to appear and produce evidence of damages and prospective relief required results in dismissal.

New Haven Bd of Educ., Andrew Miranda v.
1030148
Mount, 10/20/2016

Disability, emotional distress, mental disability, public accommodation, rehabilitation act

Final decision. Judgement for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent illegally discriminated against him when it unilaterally withdrew him from school. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent's articulated business reason for withdrawing

him from school was not credible and was instead a pretext for discrimination. The complainant was awarded $25,000 in emotional distress damages.

New Horizons Learning Center, William Abildgaard v.
0110495
FitzGerald, 08/07/03

Motion to amend complaint granted. Complaint may be amended to correct an address, change a date and to add respondent's parent corporation as a respondent.

New Horizons Learning Center, Paul L'Annunziata v.
0210153
FitzGerald, 08//07/2003

Motion to amend complaint granted. Complaint may be amended to change a date and to add respondent's parent corporation as a respondent.

New London, City of, Armando Esposito v.
9340530
Allen, 10/21/99

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) General Statutes §§ 7-430 and 46a-60(b)(1)(C) provide that age 65 is a legislatively accepted BFOQ for firefighters in Connecticut; and (2) the evidence submitted in this matter establishes that age 65 is a BFOQ for municipal firefighters.

New London Public Schools, Betsey Hudson v.
0840264
Wilson, 04/06/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent demoted and transferred her because of her race and sex. *Held*: the complainant did not establish a prima facie case because there was insufficient evidence to create an inference of discriminatory animus based on her protected status. Further, even if the complainant established a prima facie case, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason.

Nine West Group, Inc., Tampiepko Tion Cuffee v.
9720038
Trojanowski, 5/7/99

Motion to dismiss granted. The human rights referee granted a joint motion from the commission and the respondent based on the complainant's failure to respond to written and telephonic conversations for over a year.

North East Transportation Company, Inc., Philip Baroudjian v.
0430505
(appeal dismissed)
Wilkerson Brillant 07/16/08

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged discrimination in the terms and conditions of his employment on the basis of his race, color, alienage, national origin and ancestry (Arabic). Held: The commission and the complainant failed to prove under both the mixed motive and pretext analyses that the respondent discriminated against the complainant by treating him differently than non-basis similarly situated employees because of his ancestry and national origin (Arabic) when it suspended him for one day and warned him.

Norwalk, City of, Martin H. Maier v.
9320024
Norwalk Municipal Employees Assoc., Martin H. Maier v.
9320026
FitzGerald, 9/29/99

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. The complainant failed to prove *prima facie* case and intentional age discrimination.

Norwalk, City of, Board of Education, John J. Saunders v.
9820124
(appeal dismissed)
Wilkerson, 9/29/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant established prima facie case in failure to promote race, age, and color discrimination case and the respondent's proffered legitimate reasons were false thus pretextual; (2) the complainant teacher applied for the position/promotion of assistant principal and was denied position due to his race, age, and color; (3) the respondent did not satisfy its burden of proving The complainant failed to mitigate; (4) Award for back pay damages of $56,390.00 plus pre-and post-judgment interest and front pay of $18,796.67 per year until the respondent offers the complainant the next available assistant principal position or until retirement.

Norwalk Economic Opportunity Now Inc., Saeed Mohammed v.
1420210
Mount, 09/15/2014

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay of $721, pre-judgment interest of $72.30 per week, emotional distress damages of $1,000 and post-judgment interest.

Nutmeg Securities, Fieldpoint Private Bank & Trust, M. Rochlin, Andrew Schopick v.
1123092, 1120439, 1120440
Wilson, 12/08/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent in part and for the complainant in part. The complainant alleged that Nutmeg discriminated against him on the basis of his age in terminating his employment and had retaliated against him for his previous opposition to a discriminatory practice. He alleged that Rochlin had also retaliated against him and aided and abetted Nutmeg Securities in its retaliatory action. He further alleged that Fieldpoint discriminated against him on the basis of his age, aided and abetted in the retaliatory actions taken against him, and was liable for the violations committed by Nutmeg Securities as its successor in interest. *Held*: Age discrimination claim against Nutmeg dismissed because it terminated the complainant's employment because of low production, not because of age discrimination. Nutmeg and Rochlin retaliated against the complainant but no damages were awarded because there was no proof of damages. Complaint against Fieldpoint dismissed because no liability found against Nutmeg as to age discrimination.

Olsten Services, Inc., Kim Brown v.
9920046
(appeal dismissed 11/10/99; following appeal, stipulated judgment)
Giliberto, 2/19/99

Motion to open default granted. Held*:* (1) human rights referee has authority at default hearing to open default entered by acting executive director (2) matter referred back to investigative office.

Pace Motor Lines, Roger A. Czuchra v.
0820039
Austin, 10/22/10

The respondent's motion to subpoena witness to a deposition denied. The respondent argued that CGS 51-85 authorized the issuance of a subpoena to depose a witness it intended to call at trial. The respondent further proffered that given that the intended witness gave testimony that conflicted with a previously sworn to affidavit, good cause existed to issue a subpoena. Held: CGS 51-85 does not authorize the issuance of a subpoena to depose a witness in agency proceedings and that the conflict between the testimony and affidavit can be brought out at trial.

Payless Shoesource, Inc., Sheron Rose v.
9920353
FitzGerald, 11/1/99

Hearing in damages. Employee terminated from employment on the basis of national origin and ancestry, and for opposing the respondent's discriminatory employment practice. The complainant was awarded front pay, backpay, and other equitable remedies.

Laura v Pelham Sloane, Inc.; Laura Pullicino
0920214
Bromley, 10/10/2012

Hearing in damages. Responded defaulted for failure to appear and for failure to file and answer. The complainant alleged that she was terminated from her employment because of her disability. The complainant awarded $76,793 in backpay, unreimbursed medical expenses and pre- and post-judgment interest. Respondent further order to pay $44,729 to the state representing unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Peluso, George, Dennis Perri v.
0750113
Austin, 6/13/08

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent alleged that because the complaint that was filed beyond the 180 day filing requirement, it was untimely filed and the commission subject matter jurisdiction. Held: the 180 day filing requirement does not confer subject matter jurisdiction but is more similarly related to a statute of limitation subject to equitable tolling. Based on the actions taken by the CHRO investigator, the filing by the complainant Sonia Perri was subject to equitable tolling.

Pennino, Marc & Marie, and John & Karen Bauco, Nicole Thompson v
0450008
(appeal withdrawn)
Austin, 03/02/07

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: The complainant proved she was denied an advertised apartment for rent due to her source of income (section 8) in violation of 46a-64c (a) (3). The basis of the finding was found under a strict liability interpretation of the statute in that the respondents stated to the complainant that section 8 was not being accepted. Damages for both emotional distress and loss of the section 8 benefit were awarded totaling $15,280.69. Attorney fees were awarded in the amount of $42,493.50 after having reduced the original fee request.

Pennino, Marc & Marie, Nicole Thompson v.,
0450008
(appeal withdrawn)
Austin, 07/08/07

Final decision on reconsideration. The respondent's petition for reconsideration requested that certain factual findings be corrected to comport with the testimony at the public hearing along with reconsideration of legal conclusions reached that supported the finding in complainant's favor. Held: After granting the petition to reconsider, and having conducted a hearing on the respondent's petition the final decision was modified to correct two facts

(paragraphs 12 and 24) contained therein. In all other respects the decision was affirmed as originally rendered.

Peter Pan Bus Lines, Samuel Braffith v.
0540183
Wilkerson Brillant, 11/13/09

Motion in limine denied. The respondent moved to exclude evidence regarding the complainant's emotional distress damages because it posited that the commission does not have the authority to award emotional distress damages in employment discrimination cases where § 46a-60 is alleged. This tribunal awards emotional distress damages based on the premise that when a respondent has violated a federal law, e.g., Title VII, covered under § 46a-58 (a); then remedies under § 46a-86 (c), which include emotional distress damages, are available.

Pleasant Valley Mobile Home Park, Stephen Kondratowicz v.
0250051
FitzGerald, 6/4/02

Ruling on motion to amend complaint. The commission's motion granted to amend complaint adding three respondents and an additional act of retaliation. The commission's motion was timely filed, no showing of prejudice to the respondents, and the additional respondents will enable a complete determination of the issues.

Pollack's, Sheila Allen v.
9710692
Manzione, 6/17/99

Motion to dismiss granted. At a public hearing, the human rights referee granted a motion to dismiss from the respondent's counsel (with the support of the commission) based on complainant's failure to cooperate. (The complainant was pro se and failed to respond to numerous communications from the commission counsel and the Office of Public Hearings).

Polish American Citizen's Club, Maria Masterson v.
1030184
Mount, 10/31/2014

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. Complainant awarded $7,261 and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Polish American Citizen's Club, Wendy Peters v.
1220183
Mount, 12/08/2014

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear. The respondent was ordered to pay the complainant $2,752 in backpay and pre- and post judgement interest. The

respondent was further ordered to pay the state $1518 in reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Pond Point Health Care Center d/b/a Lexington Health Care, Henrietta Lorraine Stevens Samuel v.
0230332
Wilkerson, 9/9/04

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to appear at a hearing conference and failure to file an answer. The respondent had terminated/suspended and harassed the complainant multiple times during her employment with the respondent. Discrimination and retaliation based on race, color (Black) and physical disability (hypertension cardiac). The complainant was awarded $17,788.95 for back pay and $1,778.89 for prejudgment interest and 10% per year for postjudgment interest.

Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, Bruce Alexsavich & Ronald Ferguson v.
9330373, 9330374
Manzione, 10/4/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* The complainants proved a prima facie case because they were members of a protected class under the ADEA (over age 40), qualified for the position, demoted under circumstances giving rise to an inference of age discrimination. They failed, however, to meet their ultimate burden of proving age discrimination because they did not prove that the respondent's legitimate, non-discriminatory reason of selection for the reduction in force (RIF) based on performance was pretextual.

Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals, Inc., John Crebase v.
0330171
FitzGerald, 09/07/05

Motion for sanctions granted. The respondent moved that the complainant be sanctioned for failure to comply with the presiding human rights referee's order to produce documents. The complainant is sanctioned as follows: (1) it is established that the respondent did not terminate the complainant's employment because of his mental disorder; (2) no evidence shall be introduced that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his mental disorder and (3) no evidence shall be introduced that the complainant has a mental disorder.

Procter & Gamble Pharmaceutical, Inc., John Crebase v.
0330171
(appeal withdrawn)
FitzGerald, 07/12/06

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant established that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) (Title VII) and 46a-60 (a) when it

terminated his employment because of his age, sex and mental disability. The complainant was awarded damages including two years of back pay, reinstatement, pre-and post-judgment interest, and emotional distress.

Professional Help Desk, Thomas E. Shulman v.
9720041
(appeal dismissed)
Trojanowski, 6/7/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant is an "individual with a disability" due to his physical impairment of being a wheelchair-bound paraplegic which was found to substantially limit the major life activities of walking and running; (2) The complainant was qualified to perform the essential functions of the job because of his educational background and prior work experience; (3) The complainant requested four reasonable accommodations in order to assist him in performing the essential functions of his job which the respondent never provided; (4) The respondent never introduced any evidence of undue hardship; (5) The complainant's impairment of being a wheelchair-bound paraplegic met both of the definitions of "physically disabled" as well as "reliance on a wheelchair" under state law; and (6) The complainant proved that he was retaliated against through his discharge for exercising his right to request reasonable accommodations under the ADA.

Public Health, Dept. of, Pamela Hodge v.
9710032
(appeal dismissed)
Manzione, 10/6/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The respondent is ordered to promote the complainant and pay her backpay with simple interest. Although the complainant did not formally apply for the position when it was posted, she made enough efforts to find out about the position while she was out on a maternity/medical leave to meet the application requirement under *McDonnell Douglas*. She should have been considered for the position and had she been considered, she would have been hired based on her education, training, experience and status as an affirmative action goal candidate.

Public Health, Dept. of, Joel Matson v.
9930311
Wilkerson, 03/25/04

Motion for sanctions granted in part, denied in part. The commission on Human Rights and Opportunities requested sanctions imposed on the respondent for failure to comply with the Referee's ruling on a motion to compel which ordered the respondent to produce certain production requests during document discovery. The respondent did not respond to the motion for sanctions within the allotted fourteen days per Connecticut Rules of Practice nor did the respondent ever provide pertinent law to support its position not to comply with the order to produce the requested documents. The Referee imposed sanctions on the

respondent in that an order was entered finding: that the complainant was treated differently (less favorably) than similarly situated employees not in the complainant's protected class; that similarly situated employees not in the complainant's protected class were never placed on administrative leave for having filed work place violation reports; and that the respondent is excluded from introducing into evidence documents or testimony regarding the complainant's alleged symptoms or patterns of retaliation and recrimination used as a defense.

Public Safety, Dept. of, Corrine Perry v.
0830218
Bromley, 01/10/2014

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that the respondent failed to select her as a trooper training because of her age. Held: the complainant failed to establish that the background investigator harbored and acted with discriminatory animus.

Pulte Homes, Inc., Michele Milton v.
0630188
(appeal withdrawn)
FitzGerald, 12/03/09

Final decision. The complainant alleged that the respondent, her former employer, violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) and Title VII when she was harassed, received unequal pay and was subsequently terminated because of her age and sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that that the complainant was harassed or terminated because of her sex or her age. The commission, though, did establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the complainant received less compensation than similarly situated non-basis sales managers because of her sex and/or age and relief awarded.

RainDance Technologies, Inc., Ahmadali Tabatabai v.
0830168
Bromley, 8/28/2012

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. On November 2, 2007, the complainant filed a complaint, alleging in part, that he had been harassed and given poor evaluations because of his national origin and religion. On February 2, 2021, he filed an amended complaint alleging retaliation for having about discriminatory conduct. The respondent's motion to dismiss was denied without prejudice to the harassment and poor evaluation claims because there was insufficient evidence to determine whether the claims were untimely or part of a pattern. The motion to dismiss the amended claim was granted as untimely because it alleged a new and different cause of action.

RCK Corp. dba JP Dempsey's, Kevin Langan v.
0730256
Knishkowy, 1/15/09

Motion to compel granted. The complainant was terminated from his position as "bar manager" in the respondent restaurant, allegedly because of his disabilities (real and/or perceived). The commission filed request for production that included requests for information about other employees--information likely found in personnel files. The respondent objected to certain requests for disclosure as overly burdensome, not "germane" to the complaint, and protected by the privacy rights of other employees. Ruling: (1) a claim of "unduly burdensome" requires some explanation of the nature of the burden; mere recitation of the phrase is insufficient; (2) because the complainant/commission are comparing the respondent's treatment of the complainant with that of other employees, certain information about other employees may be relevant or, when disclosed, may lead to the discovery of relevant information; (3) Although General Statutes § 31-128f protects the confidentiality and integrity of personnel files, there are several narrow exceptions, one of which allows disclosure "pursuant to a lawfully issued administrative summons or judicial order . . . or in response to . . . the investigation or defense of personnel-related complaints against the employer."

Regal Stageways Limousines, Robert Whitney v.
0630256
Bromley, 3/26/2012

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to appear and file an answer in employment termination case predicated upon age discrimination. The complainant was awarded back pay ($59,302), prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest.

Regional School District No. 7, Joyce Sperow v.
0130607
Kerr, 12/01/05

Motion to dismiss granted. Teacher termination matter based upon sex (female) age and religion (Methodist). Motion predicated on res judicata and collateral estoppel as a result of termination being upheld by impartial state hearing panel (General Statutes 10-151) and superior court on appeal from panel ruling. Motion granted as to claims under General Statutes 46a-60(a)(1) and the ADEA. Motion denied as to claims under General Statutes 46a—58(a) and Title VII.

Regional School District No 7, Joyce Sperow v.
0130607
Kerr, 01/04/06

Motion for reconsideration denied. Held: The request did not meet the statutory standards warranting reconsideration and grossly mischaracterized the final decision by not recognizing that while certain of the complainant's claims were found to be barred by issue preclusion

(back pay, reinstatement), others (injunctive relief) were protected by the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the matter could proceed on the limited basis authorized therein.

Revenue Services, Dept. of, Shared Saksena v.
9940089
(appeal withdrawn)
Knishkowy, 8/9/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant suffered from depression and sought, as accommodation, the ability to work at home. When his request was denied, he resigned. In this instance, working at home was not a reasonable accommodation. Furthermore, the respondent did provide other reasonable accommodations to complainant. The complainant also failed to prove constructive discharge because he was unable to prove that the respondent denied him a reasonable accommodation and because he was unable to show that the respondent intentionally created a work environment so intolerable that would force a reasonable person to resign voluntarily.

Rinaldi, Raymond & Sylvia, JoAnn Andrees v.
0650116
FitzGerald, 12/10/08 :

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. The complainant alleged that the respondents discriminated against her in violation of 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1982 and Title VIII and also General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64c (a) (1) and (2) when they refused to rent a condominium unit to her because of her race and color. Held: The commission and the complainant cannot establish their prima facie case and/or cannot establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents intentionally discriminated against the complainant because of her race and color because they failed to provide credible persuasive evidence that the respondents knew the complainant was black.

Ritz Realty, Quality Towing, Laurie Turner v.
9920135, 9920136
FitzGerald, 6/22/99

Hearing in damages. Criteria for emotional distress damages. One complainant is awarded $125.00 in economic damages.

Roadway Package Systems, Inc. , Kathrine Vendryes v.
9830539
Knishkowy, 11/18/99

Ruling on Interrogatories. Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Rockhead, Doreen, Caterina Caggiano v.
0450017
Trojanowski, 05/05/04

Hearing in damages. Housing case. The complainant was awarded $210 in compensatory damages for medical care, $150 for attorney's fees, $4,500 for emotional distress damages and post judgment interest of 10% per annum.

Rosen, Dr. Fredric, DDS, Barbara G. DeRosa v.
9830057
Giliberto, 7/22/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Motion to amend granted in part. Held*:* (1) Complaint may be amended to correct statutory bases for discrimination; (2) General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) imposes individual liability; (3) complaint may be amended to cite in the proper respondent; (4) claim pursuant to § 46a-60(a)(5) may not be added to the complaint.

Rosen, Dr. Fredric, DDS, Barbara G. DeRosa v.
9830057
Giliberto, 8/17/99

Motion to dismiss federal claims granted in part. Federal claims under ADEA and ADA are dismissed due to employer having less than minimum number of employees.

Rosen, Dr. Fredric, DDS, Barbara G. DeRosa v.
9830057
Giliberto, 8/20/99

Motion to stay pending declaratory ruling from the commission denied. Held*:* (1) executive director cannot file motions as she is represented by the commission counsel; (2) chief human rights referee performs administrative function and cannot rule in place of presiding human rights referees; (3) the human rights referees have duty to address matters in more expedient fashion than the court system; and (4) declaratory rulings are no more binding than final decisions in other contested cases and do not require halt to all potentially related proceedings.

Ruellan, Andre, Jeffery Daniels v.
0550012
Kerr, 11/6/06

Final decision. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in being denied rental housing on the basis of disability and source of income. The respondent denied the claim based on disability and rebutted the source of income claim by stating that his denial was predicated on the permissible consideration of insufficient income. Held: The disability claim was dismissed for lack of evidence and judgment for the complainant was entered on

the source of income claim. The formula the respondent had used to determine insufficient income was legally flawed, and could be applied so as to eliminate virtually all Section 8 applicants. The complainant was awarded $4275 plus interest for all claims (which sum included a small award for emotional distress) and complainant's counsel was awarded a discounted attorney's fee in the amount of $10,150.

Salvation ARC, Thaddeus v.
1010252
Wilson, 02/27/2012

Ruling. The complainant's motion to amend his complaint denied as he had previously obtained a release of jurisdiction.

Sam's Club, Wal-mart Stores Inc., Cori Tavares v.
9730092
(decision vacated on appeal by stipulated judgment)
Wilkerson, 11/8/99

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent due to the complainant's failure to appear for the public hearing. Sanctions in the form of attorney fees and court reporter costs imposed against the complainant's attorney.

Seafood Peddler, Maria S. Rountree v.
9830387
FitzGerald, 5/14/99

Motion to amend complaint denied. Provides criteria for amending complaints to add complainants/respondents.

Shelton, City of, and Echo Hose Ambulance, Brenda Puryear v.
1130518
Bromley, 01/10/2013

Motion to strike. Complainant alleged that the respondents discriminated against her on the basis of her race and color. *Held*: motion granted. There was no employment relationship as the complainant was a volunteer, not an employee.

Smart Choice Preservation, Leonicio Tineo v.
1730253
Wright, 08/14/2019

Hearing in damages. *Held*: the complainant awarded $2,378 in backpay; $45,000 in emotional distress damages and pre- and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $7,008 as reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Smart Home Preservation, Robinson Morales-Martinez v.
1730254
Wright, 08/14/2019

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $25,572 in backpay, $45,000 in emotional distress damages, and pre- and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $13,312 in reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Smart Home Preservation, Ezequiel Ramirez v.
1730247
Wright, 08/14/2019

Hearing in damages. *Held*: Complaint dismissed for failure to comply with all requisite procedural notices and jurisdictional requirements.

SNET Co., Devon Green v.
9420217
Knishkowy, 4/12/00

Ruling on interrogatories. Held*:* Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Sno White Avenue Car Wash, David Graves, Jr. v.
0330082
Wilkerson, 02/08/06

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held: The complainant proved that the respondent's proffered business reason for terminating his employment was false, but he failed to prove that the false reason was a pretext for discrimination. The record revealed non-discriminatory reasons for the termination and, therefore, the complainant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent terminated him because of his Puerto Rican ancestry.

Social Services, Dept. of, Lisa Charette v.
9810371, 9810581
FitzGerald, 4/26/01

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. The complainant alleged harassment based on disability, retaliation, sexual harassment, and failure to provide reasonable accommodation for her disability. Held*:* (1) Upon motion to dismiss by the respondents for lack of jurisdiction, the allegations for which no reasonable cause was found (harassment based on disability and retaliation) were dismissed at the commencement of the public hearing. (2) The sexual harassment allegation was dismissed. Evidence alleging the conduct occurred was not credible. Alternatively, the conduct, even if it occurred, did not rise to the

level of actionable harassment. Also, the complainant unreasonably failed to utilize the employer's complaint procedure and to cooperate in the employer's investigation. (3) The allegation of failure to provide reasonable accommodation was dismissed. Reasonable accommodation is required under state antidiscrimination law. The complainant rejected the respondents' offer of a reasonable accommodation relative to the complainant's arrive time to work. The complainant failed to participate in the requisite good faith interactive process to determine the necessity of the requested private office, job restructuring, and special light bulbs.

Southern Connecticut State University, John Pappy v.
0730288
FitzGerald, 06/28/10

Motion to compel denied. The respondent sought all medical records from 1997 to date because the complainant claims damages for emotional distress. The respondent also sought personnel records from the complainant's employers prior to the respondent hiring the complainant in 1989. Ruling: (1) the medical records are exempt from disclosure because the complainant is alleging "garden variety" emotional distress, and psychological and mental conditions are not elements in a claim for garden variety emotional distress and (2) employment records from over twenty years ago are not relevant and material to the employment conditions alleged by the complainant or to the defenses raised by the respondent in its answer.

Southern Connecticut State University, John Pappy v.
0730288
FitzGerald, 10/12/10

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and §§ 46a-58 (a) (1) and (4), and 46a-60 (a) and 46a-70 (a) and (e). Motion granted as to the § 46a-58 (a) retaliation claim; motion denied as to the § 46a-58 (a) race and national origin claims. Motion denied, without prejudice, as to the claim of untimeliness.

Southern CT State Univ., Valerie Lorimer
1230447
Mount, 05/07/2015

Motion to strike. *Held*: motion denied. The complainant pleaded sufficient facts to sustain her claim. Whether an entity is a place of public accommodation is a fact specific inquiry.

Specialty Transportation, John Kitchens v.
1010206
Wilson, 03/02/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held: The evidence failed to establish that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his age.

Spruance, David M., Kathleen M. Shea v.
9640243
FitzGerald, 10/26/99

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant failed to prove that sexual harassment was sufficiently pervasive or severe to create an abusive work environment. (2) The complainant proved retaliation claim. Although the complainant did not prove sexual harassment claim, she demonstrated good faith belief in the underlying challenged actions. The complainant proved the respondent's business reason was pretextual by showing that the reason was not worthy of credence.

Stamford, City of, David L. Lenotti v.
0520402
Wilkerson, 08/30/07

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* an alleged discriminatory decision to deny the complainant an accommodation made prior to the 180 days of the filing of the complaint that was referenced in a second alleged discriminatory decision to deny an accommodation that was made within the 180 days of the filing the complaint shall not be dismissed as untimely. The allegation outside of the 180 days is relevant because it directly relates to the timely made allegations of the complaint and shows that the respondent engaged in a pattern of discriminatory practice.

Stamford, City of, David L. Lenotti, v.
0520402
(on appeal, stipulated judgment)
Wilkerson, 04/08/08

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: The respondent discriminated against the complainant by failing to accommodate the complainant's learning disability when it denied him a reasonable accommodation to take an exam. The respondent failed to engage in an interactive process with the complainant. The respondent did not prove its safety defense or its defense that the exam was job-related. The complainant's claims of failure to promote, denied raise and differential rate of pay are dismissed. The complainant was awarded the accommodation of additional time to take the captain promotional exam and if he obtained the required score, he was awarded the captain position. If no captain position is available, the respondent would pay the complainant the difference in the captain and lieutenant salaries.

Stamford, City of, Police Dept., Claude Young v.
0720418
FitzGerald, 11/18/09

Motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated § 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64 and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment when he was subjected to excessive use of force, police brutality, verbally abusive language and racial slurs. Held: the respondent is a public accommodation for purposes of § 46a-64, and the complaint may be amended to allege additional facts to show an equal protection violation enforceable through § 46a-58 (a).

Sterling, Inc., Mystraine Onoh v.
9620499
Manzione, 6/22/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* (1) Construing the facts in a light most favorable to the non-moving party, facts are in dispute, therefore, case is not ripe for a Motion to Dismiss; (2) human rights referees have the authority to dismiss a complaint even absent a full evidentiary hearing on the merits.

Subway Stratford LLC, Patricia Lopez v.
1120261
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $44,033 in back pay, $3000 in attorney's fees, $500 in emotional distress damages and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to reimburse the state $18,179 in unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Sunrise Estates, LLC, Edgardo Cosme v.
0510210
FitzGerald, 06/29/07

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: the respondent failed to reasonably accommodate the complainant's mental disability; discriminated against the complainant in the terms, conditions and privileges of his employment because of his mental disability; and terminated his employment because of his mental disability. The complainant awarded relief including $36,696 in back pay; $45,136 in front pay (four years); and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Thames Talent, Ltd., Angela Malizia v.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 7/23/99

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* (1) Corporate officer/shareholder/director who performs traditional employee duties on a full-time basis is counted as an "employee" to meet the three-employee requirement of General Statutes §46a-51(10). (2) Corporate officers cannot claim to be de facto partners in order to avoid their responsibilities under the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Thames Talent, Ltd., Angela Malizia v.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 12/16/99

Ruling on interrogatories. Held*:* Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Thames Talent, Ltd., Angela Malizia v.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)
Knishkowy, 6/30/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant proved that her supervisor, the respondent's president, sexually harassed her and created a hostile work environment, with strict liability imputed to the respondent. The complainant was terminated from her job shortly after she complained to her supervisor about the harassment. She proved that her termination was in retaliation for opposing his behavior and demonstrated that the respondent's proffered reason—poor attitude and work performance—was a pretext and was the direct result of the supervisor's conduct. The complainant awarded backpay, prejudgment interest, costs of insurance coverage.

Torrington, City of, Holly Blinkoff v.
9530406
(remanded by Court of Appeals)
FitzGerald, 05/10/04

Motion for summary judgment granted and the case dismissed. The complainant filed her complaint with the commission in 1995. In 1997, the commission's motion for stay was granted because the complainant had filed an action in federal court in which she raised the same state discrimination claims appearing in her CHRO complaint. In the federal action, the complainant's state claims were dismissed because she failed to obtain a release from the commission. Held: The complainant had an adequate opportunity to have her state claims adjudicated in federal court. The federal dismissal of her state discrimination claims was due

to her own voluntary decision either not to proceed with those claims in federal court and/or not to seek a release from the commission.

Torrington, City of, Holly Blinkoff v.
9530406
FitzGerald, 06/28/04

On June 7, 2004, the commission filed a motion for articulation of the May 10, 2004 order dismissing the complaint. Ruling: the order of dismissal adequately articulated the basis for the dismissal.

Torrington, City of Holly Blinkoff v
9530406
FitzGerald, 07/17/07

Motion to dismiss denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent retaliated against her for filing a complaint with the commission. The respondent moved to dismiss arguing that no employment relationship existed between the complainant and the respondent. Held: under § 46a-60 (a) (4), a claim for retaliation can arise either from an employment relationship or from the filing of a complaint with the commission.

Torrington, City of, Holly Blinkoff v.
9530406
FitzGerald, 08/25/08

Final decision. The commission and the complainant established by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents retaliated against the complainant (1) in 1995 when they filed a lawsuit against her seeking injunctive relief and (2) when they scheduled her special exceptions permit application in January 1997 rather than December 1996. Nevertheless, no monetary damages are awarded as the commission and the complainant failed to establish that these retaliatory actions resulted in monetary damages to the complainant.

Torrington, City of, Nancy Gyurko v.
9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(on appeal, dismissed in part and remanded to referee in part; see supplemental. decision)
Trojanowski, 1/26/00

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) The complainants failed to prove that they were paid less than certain male employees for equal work on jobs whose performance requires equal skill, effort and responsibility and which are performed under similar working conditions. (2) the respondent's Job Study, introduced by the complainants to prove their case, was disallowed because it only measured two of the statutory criteria required by the Equal Pay Act and did not measure effort or performance under similar working conditions. (3) The complainants failed to prove discriminatory intent by the respondent in paying them less than comparable male employees. (4) the respondent's jurisdictional argument that the commission was precluded from considering the

complainants' complaints because there have been prior arbitrator's decisions on the same or similar issues as those before the Human Rights Referee, was denied because there was no written or verbal waiver of statutory rights to a hearing before the commission by the complainants or their collective bargaining agent.

Torrington, City of, Nancy Gyurko v
9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(appeal dismissed)
Trojanowski, 7/13/01 (Supplemental decision)

The appeal was dismissed as to the presiding referee's dismissal of the complainants' EPA claim and remanded for further analysis of their Title VII and CFEPA claims. On remand, Held*:* Complaint dismissed. The complainants failed to show the males to whom they compared themselves held similar or comparable jobs and failed to show discriminatory animus by the respondents.

Transportation, Dept. of, Jayantha Mather v.
9810116
(rev'd on appeal)
Manzione, 4/19/01

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The complainant proved a prima facie case that his failure to be promoted was discriminatorily based on his race and national origin (Sri Lankan). The respondent articulated two legitimate business reasons: not possessing the required Professional Engineers license and not being the candidate chosen by the interview panel. The complainant proved that these reasons were pretextual by showing that similarly situated white employees were treated differently. The complainant failed, however, to meet his burden of proving that the respondent did not promote him in retaliation for filing a prior CHRO complaint or serving as Chair of the internal affirmative action advisory committee. The respondent must pay $9,268.12 as compensation for back pay plus 10% compounded interest; promote the complainant to the next open appropriate position; pay the complainant as front pay an adjustment between his current salary and what he would have been earning had he been promoted, until he is promoted or retires, whichever comes first; credit the complainant with any vacation, personal or other days used for the hearing; and not engage in any retaliatory conduct as a result of these proceedings.

Trinity Christian School, Andrea J.R. Sokolowski v.
1110391
Bromley, 02/01/2013

Motion to dismiss. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss the complaint. The respondent contends that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the ministerial exception under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Held*: motion denied as the ministerial exception is an affirmative defense rather than a jurisdictional bar.

Trinity Christian School, Andrea Sokolowski v.
1230397
Wilson, 12/10/2015

Motion to dismiss. This is the respondent's second motion to dismiss (see Sokolowski v Trinity Christian Church, 1110391, 02/01/2013) in which it again argued that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the ministerial exception under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Held*: motion denied. At this stage of the proceeding, with no evidentiary hearing, the respondent has not established that the complainant's duties are inextricably intertwined with the school's mission.

Trinity College, Lourdes Morales v.
1110162
Mount, 02/04/2013

Ruling on the respondent's motion to dismiss. Motion granted in part and denied in part. Motion granted as to the complainant's claims regarding her suspension as they are time barred. Motion denied as to the remaining claims.

U. S. Security Associates, Inc., Elbert Daniels v.
0430286
Trojanowski, 11/17/04

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged he had been discriminated against on the basis of his race. The complainant was awarded back pay and prejudgment interest. The respondent also ordered to reimburse the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Ultimate Billiards, Lisa Genovese v.
0530337
FitzGerald, 02/09/07

Hearing in damages. The executive director defaulted the respondent for failing to respond to the commission's pre-certification interrogatories (General Statutes § 46a-54). The complainant was awarded back pay, front pay, reimbursement of medical costs that would have been paid through the respondent's employee medical benefit package, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

United Parcel Service, Inc., Nestor Rosado v.
0020469
Giliberto, 11/15/00

Hearing In Damages. Both the complainant and the respondent failed to appear. The Order of Relief included: (1) a cease and desist order against the respondent; and (2) the

respondent was ordered to place posters, to be supplied by the commission at all of its Connecticut locations.

United Pet Supply, Inc., Stephen Urban v.
0830309
Bromley, 8/2/2012

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to appear at hearing. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated his employment because of his physical disability. Respondent ordered to pay the complainant $1236 for back pay and reimburse the State of Connecticut $1764 in unemployment compensation.

United Security, Isabel Gomez v.
9930490
(appeal dismissed)
Trojanowski, 1/28/00

Hearing in damages. Female security guard awarded: (1) back pay; (2) pre-judgment interest; and (3) statutory post-judgment interest.

United Technologies Corporation, Wayne Harrington v.
9710649, 9710650
(appeal withdrawn)
Allen, 4/25/00

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant established prima facie case in failure to hire age discrimination case and the respondent's legitimate reason was pretextual; (2) the complainant sufficiently met requirement for application for position as part of his prima facie case by applying for and expressing interest in specific classes of positions; (3) Damages awarded reduced due to failure of the complainant to fully mitigate his losses by virtue of his quitting subsequent employment at another job; and (4) the complainant awarded: (a) $65, 037 in damages with interest compounded at the rate of 10%/year as of the date the position was filled by a younger person (b) the respondents ordered to hire the complainant to one of eleven positions; (c) the respondents ordered to provide retroactive pension benefits; (d) the respondents ordered to provide benefits until the complainant is rehired, or until he reaches age 66; and (e) the respondents ordered to pay the complainant $5,000.00/year front pay until he is rehired, or until age 66.

University of Bridgeport, Edward D'Angelo v.
9520184, 9520185, 9520186
Allen, 6/29/99

Motion to dismiss granted due to failure of complainants to file complaints with the commission within the 180-day period following alleged act of discrimination.

University of Connecticut Health Center, Yvonne Collette v.
0610446
Wilkerson Brillant, 07/22/08

Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part. Held: (1) Because the complaint was amended as a matter of right prior to the appointment of the undersigned presiding referee pursuant to § 46a-54-38a (a) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the state law claims are not time-barred; 2) the complainant's basis for her § 46a-58 (a) claim is not a cause of action under § 46a-60 but is a cause of action under the federal ADA and, thus, the complainant's federal ADA claim has been converted to a claim under state law by way of § 46a-58 (a) and is a valid claim; 3) § 46a-70 applies to employment discrimination in state agencies and the respondent's alleged failure to provide a reasonable accommodation in order for the complainant to resume working is covered within § 46a-70; and 4) Section 46a-77 applies to services provided to the public by state agencies and does not apply to employment discrimination claims, therefore, the complainant does not state a valid claim under § 46a-77 and her claims pursuant to § 46a-77 are dismissed.

Urban League, Lorraine Stevens v.
0010328
Knishkowy, 12/5/02

Motion to dismiss denied. Motion to dismiss may be treated as a motion to strike, where the respondents challenge not jurisdiction, but the legal sufficiency of claim. The respondents moved to dismiss portion of complaint predicated upon §46a-58(a), asserting that it cannot co-exist with §46a-60(a) employment discrimination claim, pursuant to *CHRO v. Truelove & Maclean, Inc.*, 238 Conn. 337(1996). Notwithstanding the respondents' interpretation of *Truelove*, §46a-58(a) "has expressly converted a violation of federal antidiscrimination laws [here, Title VII] into a violation of Connecticut antidiscrimination laws." (*Trimachi v. Connecticut Workers Comp. Comm*., 2000 WL 872451 (Conn. Super.)) Motion to dismiss §46a-58(a) claim, when treated as a motion to strike, is denied.

Vahlstrom, Donna & David, Marcia McIntosh-Waller v.
0750080
Wilkerson, 09/21/07

Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part. Held*:* the complainant has standing to bring a housing discrimination complaint against her neighbors alleging a hostile housing environment in which the respondents harassed and intimidated her and her family because of the complainant's race and ancestry. The complainant stated a claim for which relief can

be granted as the only party complainant to this complaint. The complainant stated a cause of action under General Statutes § 46a-64c (a) (9), Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. § 3617); and 42 U.S.C. § 1982 for a violation of her rights to use and enjoy her property. The complainant did not state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 because she did not allege that a contractual relationship existed between her and the respondents, which the respondents interfered with or prevented because of her race.

Vahlstrom, Donna & David, Marcia McIntosh-Waller v
0750080
FitzGerald, 03/19/08

The respondents' motion to reopen public hearing denied. The public hearing was held on February 20, 2008 and February 26, 2008. The respondents, represented by counsel, did not testify at the public hearing because, although they were listed on the commission's proposed witness list, the commission chose not to call them and because they were not listed on their own witness list. On March 4, 2008, the respondents moved to re-open the hearing to permit them to testify. Held*:* General Statute § 4-177c and §§ 46a-54-78a and 46a-54-90a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies provide that a party's participation in a contested case is a reasonable opportunity subject to oversight by the presiding referee, not an unrestricted right. The hearing conference summary and order of May 1, 2007 placed all parties on clear and unequivocal notice that they were to file and serve a list of the party's proposed witnesses and that witnesses not listed, except for impeachment and rebuttal, may not be permitted to testify except for good cause shown. The respondents filed a witness list but did not list themselves as witnesses and failed to file a motion to amend their list to include themselves. The requirement that all potential witnesses, including parties, be identified on the proffering party's witness list is not unreasonable and the respondents did not show that good cause existed for their failures to include themselves on their witness list.

Vahlstrom, Donna & David, Marcia McIntosh-Waller
0750080
FitzGerald, 06/06/08

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that the respondents, her neighbors, discriminated against her on the basis of her color and ancestry and created a hostile housing environment in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1982, Title VIII and General Statutes SS 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64c (a) (9). Held: (1) the respondents did not violate 42 U.S.C. § 1982, Title VIII or § 46a-58 (a) because they did not engage in violence or threaten violence; (2) § 46a-64c (9) prohibits discriminatory interference with any person in the person's post-acquisition exercise or enjoyment of his or her property. Prohibited interference includes severe, pervasive and grossly offensive nonviolent conduct directed against a person because of his or her protected status; (3) members of a household have a cause of action for actual interference in their own exercise and enjoyment of their property against a neighbor for the neighbor's severe, pervasive and grossly offensive nonviolent conduct toward any member of the household because of the member's protected status; and (4) the

commission failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents' conduct toward the complainant and her sons was (a) because of the complainant's race or ancestry and (b) sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the complainant's living conditions and to create a hostile housing environment for the complainant.

Vitas Innovative Hospice Care, Kathy Treacy v.
1320021
Wright, 04/04/2017

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her in the terms and conditions of her employment based on her learning disability and/or mental disorder. *Held*: the complainant established her prima facie case and that the respondent's articulated reasons for terminating the employment relationship were a pretext for intentional discrimination. The complainant was awarded $73,401.30 in backpay; $43,877.03 in prejudgment interest on the backpay; and $6,253.44 in reimbursement for travel expenses.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Jeffrey Clark v.
9830599
(appeal dismissed)
Wilkerson, 1/25/01

Final decision. Judgment for he respondent. The complainant filed a complaint claiming that he was demoted based on his disability. Held*:* The complainant did not establish a prima facie case under *McDonnell Douglas* proving that he was qualified by showing that he could perform the essential functions of his job with or without reasonable accommodations. The complainant also did not establish a prima facie case under *Price Waterhouse* analysis in that he did not prove that there was direct evidence of discrimination or rebut the respondent's reason for demoting the complainant.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Debra J. Intagliata v.
9740381
Giliberto, 7/31/00

Final decision. Judgment for he respondents. Held*:* (1) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case of retaliation due to her failure to prove she complained about discriminatory employment practices and failure to prove any adverse action; and (2) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case of gender discrimination due to her failure to prove that the male employee that replaced her was similarly situated and failure to prove any adverse action or inference of salary discrimination due to gender.

Wallingford, Town of, Mark Staszewski v.
1030290
Mount, 02/11/2015

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in the terms and conditions of his employment and retaliated against and that his mental disability/physical disability and previous opposition to discriminatory conduct were factors in the respondent's actions. *Held*: the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case.

Waterbury, City of, David Gilmore v.
9530587
(appeal withdrawn)
Allen, 8/11/00

Hearing in damages. The complainant was awarded: (1)back pay; (2) attorney's fees; and (3) prejudgment interest.

Waterbury, City of, David Gilmore v.
9530587
Allen, 9/7/00

Motion for reconsideration granted. The complainant's back pay award reduced by the sum of $44,076.00 which had been awarded to the complainant in previous court decision involving the same parties.

Waterbury, City of, Cynthia Leonard v.
1630341 (appeal pending)
Mount, 10/03/2019

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent did not interview her for, or promote her to, the position of human resources assistant because of her physical disability. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent's articulated reason was a pretext for discrimination. She met all the requirements of the first job posting and had been performing the job for which she had applied. The respondent's revision to the original job posting was arbitrarily and discriminatorily motivated. The complainant was awarded $118,353.06 in backpay, $35,000 in emotional distress damages, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Waterbury Masonry & Foundation, Inc., Kelly Smalls v.
0330386
Trojanowski, 1/23/04

Hearing in damages. Discrimination due to a physical disability, a "drop foot" condition, in violation of General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) as well as the American with Disabilities Act, 42

U.S.C. 12101 et seq. Awarded back pay and lost benefits, prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest.

Waterbury Republican, Alan Couture v.
0630390
(on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 6/12/08

Motion to dismiss granted. The respondent newspaper refused to publish an unpaid announcement (with photograph) of the complainant's same sex civil union with those of marriages similarly submitted. The complainant alleged a denial of a public accommodation under General Statutes § 46a-64 on the basis of sexual orientation and marital status. The he respondent claimed First Amendment protection in the exercise of its editorial discretion. Held*:* while there have been legally recognized encroachments on a newspaper's First Amendment rights so as to advance other competing governmental and public interests, such encroachments have not been found in Connecticut (or elsewhere) to extend to the content of unpaid public/personal announcements in a newspaper under the theory that it is a public accommodation. Without a basis for determining that the respondent was a public accommodation for these purposes, the complainant was found to have failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

Waterbury Republican, Robert McDonald v.
0630389
(on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)
Kerr, 6/12/08

Motion to dismiss granted. The respondent newspaper refused to publish an unpaid announcement (with photograph) of the complainant's same sex civil union with those of marriages similarly submitted. The complainant alleged a denial of a public accommodation under General Statutes § 46a-64 on the basis of sexual orientation and marital status. The respondent claimed First Amendment protection in the exercise of its editorial discretion. Held*:* while there have been legally recognized encroachments on a newspaper's First Amendment rights so as to advance other competing governmental and public interests, such encroachments have not been found in Connecticut (or elsewhere) to extend to the content of unpaid public/personal announcements in a newspaper under the theory that it is a public accommodation. Without a basis for determining that the respondent was a public accommodation for these purposes, the complainant was found to have failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

Webster Bank, Arline Stephenson v.
1110235
Mount, 08/22/2013

Ruling on motion for summary judgment re ADEA: The complainant brought an age discrimination claim under the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) as enforced through General Statute Section 46a-58(a) and under General Statute Sections

46a-60(a)(1) and (4). *Held*: the ADEA claim is dismissed as age is not an enumerated protected class in Section 46a-58(a).

Webster Bank, Arline Stephenson v.
1110235
Bromley, 08/22/2013

Ruling on motion for summary judgement re: General Statute 46a-60(a)(1) and (4) claims. *Held*: motion denied as the complainant has shown that there are genuine issues of material facts regarding the role of the complainant's protected class status in determining her priority in the reduction in force and her termination.

West Hartford Housing Authority, Herman Filshtein v.
0050061
Wilkerson, 10/04/01

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The respondent discriminated against the complainant who was disabled by failing to reasonably accommodate him in housing. The complainant proved a prima facie case of failure to reasonably accommodate. The respondent did not meet its burden to prove that the accommodation was unreasonable. The complainant was awarded $2,500 for emotional distress damages with post-judgment interest, $7,497 for back rental fees paid with pre- and post-judgment interest, and the complainant's attorney was awarded $5,850 for attorney fees with post-judgment interest. The complainant was also awarded $252 (differential rental fee) per month until the respondent grants him a Section 8 certificate for his current dwelling.

West Hartford, Town of, Barry E. Amos. v.
9910041, 9910198, 9910199, 9910200, 9910201, 9910202
Manzione, 6/5/00

Motion for stay denied. Held*:* A matter scheduled for public hearing in six weeks will not be stayed pending the outcome of a possible declaratory judgment by a judicial authority because (1) the commission is charged with addressing complaints of discrimination; (2) the commission declined to address this matter through a declaratory ruling and rather set the matter down for these "specified proceedings;" (3) the matter is ripe for adjudication because most of the pre-hearing matters have already occurred; and (4) proceeding with the public hearing, rather than staying it, will resolve the "real and substantial dispute between the parties."

West Hartford, Town of, Thomas George v.
0910466
Wilson, 10/01/2015

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated the Americans with Disabilities Act as enforced under General Statute 46a-58(a) when it failed to make a modification to its refuse and recycling collection services. *Held:* the it is not a violation of the ADA for a public entity to refuse to perform any function for the benefit of any individual that exceeds their physical abilities so long as the public entity does not perform that service for able-bodied resident.

Westport Big & Tall, Inc., Sandor Nemeth v.
0920337
(remand by agreement)
FitzGerald, 7/23/10

The presiding referee dismissed the complaint sua sponte for the complainant's failure to appear. Neither the complainant nor his attorney attended the hearing conference.

W.E.T. National Relocation Services, Joan B. Hansen v. 0020220
Wilkerson, 11/14/01

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* Under State law, the respondent discriminated against the complainant because of her age, 66, at the time of filing the complaint by terminating her employment. The complainant's federal claim was dismissed because the respondent did not employ at least 20 employees. The complainant proved a prima facie case of age discrimination in employment. The complainant proved that the respondent's proffered reason was unworthy of credence and therefore, pretextual. The complainant was awarded $14,493.00 for back pay with $1,449.00 for prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest at 10% for the unpaid balance.

Western Connecticut State University, John Caruso, Jr. v.
0620214
FitzGerald, 3/18/09

Motion to dismiss granted in part. The complainant is employed by the respondent as a professor. On November 3, 2005, he filed an affidavit with the commission alleging that because of his participation on behalf of his wife's discrimination claim against the respondent, the respondent thereafter retaliated against him. The complainant identified three retaliatory acts, one of which occurred in 2004. (The 2004 retaliatory act was also included in a prior affidavit the complainant had filed with the commission in 2004. The commission dismissed the 2004 affidavit after finding no reasonable cause). Following an unsuccessful conciliation conference on December 12, 2008, the complainant filed an amended affidavit that included as a fourth alleged retaliatory act a failure to hire claim that arose in 2005. Held: the 2004 allegation was dismissed as untimely filed and as precluded by the res judicata effect of the commission's dismissal of the 2004 complaint. The 2005

failure to hire claim was not saved by the “relate back” doctrine and was dismissed as untimely.

Wireless Retail, Inc., Randall Saex v.
0410175
FitzGerald, 07/26/2006

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear at a settlement conference. The complainant alleged, in part, that the respondent harassed him and terminated his employment because of his age, religion and sex. The complainant was awarded damages including back pay, front pay, reimbursement of medical expenses, pre- and post-judgment interest, and emotional distress.

Yale University, Erin Dwyer v.
0130315, 0230323
Wilkerson, 11/29/05

Final decision. Judgment, in part, for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against the complainant by 1) failing to respond to her continued reports of workplace harassment by both co-workers and management; 2) by treating her dissimilarly to other employees in trial periods; and 3) by suspending and ultimately terminating her because she is a transgendered woman with a mental disability who was, or was perceived to be homosexual, and in retaliation for participating in the University’s grievance process and filing a CHRO complaint. Held*:* The respondent violated General Statutes § 46a-81c(1) by creating a hostile work environment based on the complainant’s sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation during her employment at one of its facilities when it failed to take reasonable steps to remedy the hostile work environment. The respondent is liable to the complainant for her injuries. The complainant is entitled to an award of back pay along with 10% pre and post-judgment interest. The commission and the complainant failed to prove that the respondent discriminated, retaliated or aided and abetted discrimination against the complainant for the lost promotions, demotions, poor evaluations, being placed on probation, failure to accommodate, and the suspension and termination and those claims are dismissed.

Yale University, Mary Beth Garceau v.
0530073
FitzGerald, 12/05/05

Motion to compel granted in part. Inter alia, the respondent, pursuant to General Statutes § 31-128f (2), was ordered to produce disciplinary records.

Yale University, Roderick Melvin v.
0230320
Trojanowski, 07/19/06

Amended final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in the terms and conditions of his employment; given warnings, poor evaluations and unfairly disciplined; received unequal pay; retaliated against; not promoted; and terminated because of his having filed a complaint with the commission, and his race, color, and perceived disability. Held: The complainant was unable to show that the respondent's explanation for its actions (the complainant's history of poor work performance) was a pretext for its actions. The complainant was also unable to show that any harassment was so severe or pervasive as to create a hostile work environment.

Yale University, Qazi Azam
0430623
FitzGerald, 10/16/2006

Motion to compel granted in part. Inter alia, the respondent, pursuant to General Statutes § 31-128f (2), was ordered to produce documents submitted by the successful candidates for the job positions the complainant had applied for.

Yale-New Haven Hospital, Sharyn L. Grant v.
9530477
Knishkowy, 10/13/99

Final decision. Judgment for he respondent. The complainant failed to prove that her discharge was the result of unlawful discrimination based on race, color, or disability. The respondent articulated—and convincingly proved—a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the discharge; i.e., the complainant could not perform her essential job duties even with reasonable accommodation, and there were no other positions to which she could reasonably be assigned. Furthermore, the respondent satisfied its duty to reasonably accommodate the complainant.

Yale-New Haven Hospital, Jacqueline Isler v.
9730024
Manzione, 3/3/99

Ruling on discovery motions. Held*:* (1) There is no authority for interrogatories at the commission; (2) human rights referees may grant or deny motions to compel on specific discovery issues.

Yale New Haven Hospital, Bhagmattie Perreira v.
1430048
Mount, 09/07/2016

Motion for summary judgement. Motion granted. Two years prior to filing this complaint against Yale New Haven Hospital (YNHH), the complainant has filed a complaint against the Hospital of Saint Raphael (HSR). The complaint filed against YNHH, successor in interest to HSR. The complaint again YNHH is nearly identical to the earlier one filed against HSR. Subsequent to filing the complaint against YNHH, the complainant signed a release and settlement agreement in her case against HSR. *Held*: motion granted. The principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel apply. If the complainant were to go forward and be successful in this complaint, she would be recovering for an alleged injury for which she has already been compensated.

Zheng Trust LLC dba Koto Japanese Restaurant, Roxanne Punzalan v.
1140112
Mount, 10/28/2014

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay in the amount of $9,861.50; emotional distress damages of $7,500; attorney fees in the amount of $8,150, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

zUniversity.com, Elizabeth Downes v.
0210366
Trojanowski, 9/12/03

Hearing in damages. The complainant terminated because of her gender, familial status and her pregnancy. Damages included back pay.

IV. Decisions/ruling listed alphabetically by presiding human rights referee

Allen, 6/29/99
D'Angelo, Edward v. University of Bridgeport
9520184, 9520185, 9520186

Motion to dismiss granted due to failure of complainants to file complaints with the commission within the 180-day period following alleged act of discrimination.

Allen, 7/8/99
Blake, Lugenia v. Beverly Enterprises-Connecticut
9530630

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) human rights referees have authority to dismiss matters; (2) prior administrative decision by a separate state agency is given res judicata effect; (3) the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case for employment discrimination.

Allen, 9/1/99
Leslie, Willie v. City of New Haven
9830575

Hearing in damages. Held*:* (1) request to suspend hearing denied as being unreasonable after five prior continuances; and (2) the complainant and the commission's failure to appear and produce evidence of damages and prospective relief required results in dismissal.

Allen, 10/21/99
Esposito, Armando v. City of New London
9340530

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) General Statutes §§ 7-430 and 46a-60(b)(1)(C) provide that age 65 is a legislatively accepted BFOQ for firefighters in Connecticut; and (2) the evidence submitted in this matter establishes that age 65 is a BFOQ for municipal firefighters.

Allen, 12/20/99
Helliger, Patricia v. Avalon Properties
9730397

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) the respondent Real Estate Management Corporation and its named agents discriminated against the complainant by making a rental opportunity unavailable and by misrepresenting the availability of a rental in violation of §§ 46a-64c(a)(1) and 46a-64c(a)(4)(A); (2) complainant awarded $3,000.00 damages suffered as a result of emotional distress at discriminatory treatment; (3) the complainant failed to mitigate her economic losses and no economic compensatory damages awarded.

Allen, 4/25/00
Harrington, Wayne v. United Technologies Corporation
9710649, 9710650
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) the complainant established prima facie case in failure to hire age discrimination case and he respondent's legitimate reason was pretextual; (2) the complainant sufficiently met requirement for application for position as part of his prima facie case by applying for and expressing interest in specific classes of positions; (3) damages awarded reduced due to failure of the complainant to fully mitigate his losses by virtue of his quitting subsequent employment at another job; and (4) the complainant awarded: (a) $65,037 in damages with interest compounded at the rate of 10%/year as of the date the position was filled by a younger person (b) he respondents ordered to hire the complainant to one of eleven positions; (c) the respondents ordered to provide retroactive pension benefits; (d) the respondents ordered to provide benefits until the complainant is rehired, or until he reaches age 66; and (e) he respondents ordered to pay the complainant $5,000.00/year front pay until he is rehired, or until age 66.

Allen, 5/3/00
Sarnecky, Fred v. Hamilton Standard
9910156

Ruling on motion to recuse denied. The commission sought to recuse the referee because a motion to decertify and supporting brief inadvertently sent to Office of Public Hearings. Held*:* actual bias needed to be shown to recuse hearing officer and no showing was made, particularly where Referee declined to read the briefs in denying the motion to decertify on its face.

Allen, 7/6/00
Clements, Joyce v. Town of Brookfield
9620571

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant brought an action claiming harassment and demotion based on her age and amended her complaint to assert wrongful discharge based on age and gender. Held*:* (1) the complainant's amended complaint was filed more than 180 days after the alleged act of discrimination; (2) the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case; (3) the respondent's articulated non-discriminatory reason was valid and not pre-textual; (4) the complainant failed to produce evidence inferring that the abolition of her position in the Town's budget was motivated by her age or gender; and (5) there was no evidence of the complainant being harassed or demoted.

Allen, 8/11/00
Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury
9530587
(appeal withdrawn)

Hearing in damages. The complainant was awarded: (1) back pay; (2) attorney's fees; and (3) prejudgment interest.

Allen, 9/7/00
Gilmore, David v. City of Waterbury
9530587

Motion for reconsideration granted. The complainant's back pay award reduced by the sum of $44,076.00 which had been awarded to the complainant in previous court decision involving the same parties.

Allen, 1/5/01
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski
9710196, 9710197

Remand decision. Judgment for the complainants. Held*:* the respondents discriminated against the complainants with respect to the terms and conditions of a prospective rental by requiring additional and more comprehensive credit, employment, and educational background information than was required of white tenants. The complainants are awarded $5,000.00 in damages for emotional distress.

Allen, 1/31/01
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski
9710196, 9710197

Petition for reconsideration granted. The complainants and the commission are granted 30 days to file Motions seeking an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and the respondents shall have 10 days to file objections, if any.

Allen, 4/16/01
Cooper, Ricky & Regina v. Andrew & Hanna Gorski
9710196, 9710197
(Supplemental)

The complainants awarded $20,000.00 in attorney's fees for he respondent's discrimination in regard to the terms and conditions associated with the rental of real estate; attorney's fees appropriate even where complainants represented by non-profit Legal Clinic; detailed time sheets sufficient to establish reasonableness of fees requested.

Allen, 6/12/02
Carver, Monica v. Drawbridge Inn Restaurant
9940179

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleges discrimination in the terms and conditions of her employment on the basis of her alienage (American Indian), and that she was discharged in retaliation for her complaints regarding alleged sexual harassment in the workplace. Held: The complainant failed to establish prima facie case as to her claim regarding discriminatory treatment in the terms and conditions of her employment. The complainant also failed to establish a prima facie case that she was fired in retaliation for her complaints because evidence showed, inter alia, that she quit her job.

Allen, 3/14/03
Navarro, Edwin v. Hospital for Special Care
9710678

Final decision. The complainant alleged wrongful termination based on race, color, and gender, and discrimination based on disability alleged to be ADHD and learning disability; HELD: 1. Insufficient evidence presented to establish even prima facie case based on race, color or gender; 2. the complainant failed to show he was disabled according to law and thus prima facie case not established; 3. alternatively, even assuming a prima facie case, the weight of evidence established that discharge was based on legitimate performance grounds and were not based on disability notwithstanding some credibility problems with he respondent's testimony; 4. the complainant did not properly allege a failure to accommodate claim which was asserted in its brief and in any event there was no evidence to support such a claim.

Allen, 11/17/03
Friedman, Sharon v. Office of the State Comptroller
0110195

The complainant made application for "domestic partner benefits" and was denied same on basis that state arbitration award providing such benefits applied only to same sex partners as they were unable to marry under state law. The complainant alleged that she was discriminated against by the arbitration award, because her "partner" was male, on the basis of her marital status and sexual orientation the respondent moved to dismiss complaint for failure to state a claim for which relief could be afforded. HELD: the respondent's Motion to Dismiss granted as Chapter 68 of the Connecticut General Statutes (Section 5-276 et seq.) provides for finality of such an award unless a timely motion to vacate is filed with the Superior Court, and there having been none the award is not now subject to a collateral attack through the auspices of a CHRO complaint.

Allen, 01/08/04
Soulemani, Arouna v. Mark Ash
0230045

Hearing in damages. By virtue of a default for failure to appear, the respondent was held liable for discrimination based on race, color and ancestry against the complainant with regard to the terms and conditions of his employment and for terminating his employment. The complainant was awarded $45,405 as back pay and monetary relief and post judgment interest at the rate of 10% compounded annually. Front pay was not awarded.

Austin, 10/25/05
Lopes, Elizabeth v. Comfort Suites
0540252

Hearing in damages. After having been sexually harassed by a co-worker, the complainant complained to her supervisor who took no remedial action. The complainant again complaint to her supervisor after a third instance of being sexually harassed by the same co-worker. The supervisor's response was "we are all family, enjoy it and I don't want to hear it." The following day the complainant was terminated. Discrimination was found for having previously opposed a discriminatory practice. The complainant was awarded back pay of $23,225.50 with postjudgment interest, reinstatement to the position she held at the time of termination, and front pay until such time as the complainant is reinstatement or rejects an offer of reinstatement.

Austin, 07/21/06
Joiner, David v. H.E.R.E. Local 217
0410177

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent, his union, denied him representation and also aided and abetted his employer in denying him seniority rights he was entitled to under the collective bargaining agreement. Because resolution of the merits of the complaint would have required interpreting the collective bargaining agreement, the complaint was dismissed as preempted by § 301 of the federal Labor and Management Relations Act.

Austin, 03/02/07
Thompson, Nicole v Marc & Marie Pennino and John & Karen Bauco
0450008
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: The complainant proved she was denied an advertised apartment for rent due to her source of income (section 8) in violation of 46a-64c (a) (3). The basis of the finding was found under a strict liability interpretation of the statute in that the respondents stated to the complainant that section 8 was not being accepted. Damages for both emotional distress and loss of the section 8 benefit were awarded totaling $15,280.69. Attorney fees were awarded in the amount of $42,493.50 after having reduced the original fee request.

Austin, 04/12/07
Dako-Smith, Frederica v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services
0020228 & 0220142
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. African-American complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her by subjecting her to disparate treatment and a hostile

work environment. In Case No. 0220142 the complainant alleged as a result of her filing with CHRO the respondent retaliated against her by filing a complaint with the Connecticut Department of Health. Held: The complainant failed to sustain her burden of proving a prima facie case in both complaints as to claims of discrimination and retaliation. (Transcript of decision.)

Austin, 07/07/07
Thompson, Nicole v. Marc & Marie Pennino
0450008
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision on reconsideration. The respondent's petition for reconsideration requested that certain factual findings be corrected to comport with the testimony at the public hearing along with reconsideration of legal conclusions reached that supported the finding in complainant's favor. Held: After granting the petition to reconsider, and having conducted a hearing on he respondent's petition the final decision was modified to correct two facts (paragraphs 12 and 24) contained therein. In all other respects the decision was affirmed as originally rendered.

Austin, 10/18/07
Lawton, Kimberly v. Chad Jansen
0550135

Hearing in damages: The complainant who was harassed due to her race and color by a teenage neighbor brought an action under state and federal fair housing laws. The complainant was awarded damages for emotional distress, lost wages, and attorney's fees. The complainant's claims for damages against the teenager's mother pursuant to General Statutes § 52-572 and common law negligent supervisor were not allowed.

Austin, 5/20/08
O'Halloran, Josephine v. Town of Fairfield
0620146
(appeal dismissed)

Final Decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that she was denied a promotion for the position of zoning inspector as a consequence of her gender. She further alleged that the respondent failed to follow the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Held: The complainant failed to present a prima facie case in that she failed to satisfy the element that she was qualified for the position. Further, even if the complainant had sustained her burden of being qualified, she was not the best candidate in the field of three females and one male. As to the complainant's claims that the CBA was not followed, no credible evidence was submitted to believe that the respondent used the complainant's gender in determining how to interpret the CBA.

Austin, 6/13/08
Perri, Dennis v George Peluso
0750113

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent alleged that because the complaint that was filed beyond the 180 day filing requirement, it was untimely filed and the commission subject matter jurisdiction. Held: the 180 day filing requirement does not confer subject matter jurisdiction but is more similarly related to a statute of limitation subject to equitable tolling. Based on the actions taken by the CHRO investigator, the filing by the complainant Sonia Perri was subject to equitable tolling.

Austin, 11/14/08
Peterson, Dana v City of Hartford, Police Dept.
0410049

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged she was discriminated against as a consequence of her gender and disabilities (transsexual/physical and mental/gender dysphoria disorder). She further alleged that as a consequence of her having previously opposed an alleged discriminatory employment practice, she was retaliated against by the respondent. Held: The complainant and commission failed to establish a prima facie case under the pretext model of analysis on most of the complainant's claims. As to the claims where the complainant successfully presented a prima facie case the legitimate business reason produced by the respondent for its decision was not proven to be a pretext for discrimination.

Austin, 12/15/09
Parker-Bair, Florence v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles
0510486

Motion to dismiss granted. Held: The respondent moved to dismiss complaint's allegations of retaliation for having previously opposed discrimination due to the lack of jurisdiction. The basis for the respondent's motion was that the commission's investigator did not find reasonable cause as to the claim of retaliation. Not only was there no reasonable cause found, the investigator opined that filing with the commission resulted in the complainant's promotion. There being no reasonable cause found to believe that retaliation may have occurred deprives this tribunal of jurisdiction to hear this claim.

Austin, 5/25/10
Jackson, Gloria v. Debra Lutkowski and Paul Pixbey
0950094 & 0950095

Hearing in Damages. The complainant had alleged that she was harassed due to her race and color by her neighbors (the respondents). The complainant was awarded damages for emotional distress (anxiety along with loss of weight and sleep) and for damage caused to her car.

Austin, 10/22/10
Czuchra, Roger A. v. Pace Motor Lines
0820039

The respondent's motion to subpoena witness to a deposition denied. The respondent argued that CGS 51-85 authorized the issuance of a subpoena to depose a witness it intended to call at trial. The respondent further proffered that given that the intended witness gave testimony that conflicted with a previously sworn to affidavit, good cause existed to issue a subpoena. Held: CGS 51-85 does not authorize the issuance of a subpoena to depose a witness in agency proceedings and that the conflict between the testimony and affidavit can be brought out at trial.

Bromley, 3/26/2012
Whitney, Robert v Regal Stageways Limousines
0630256

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to appear and file an answer in employment termination case predicated upon age discrimination. The complainant was awarded back pay ($59,302), prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest.

Bromley, 08/02/2012
Perry, Corrine v Dept. of Public Safety
0830218

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that the respondent failed to select her as a trooper training because of her age. Held: the complainant failed to establish that the background investigator harbored and acted with discriminatory animus.

Bromley, 08/28/2012
Tabatabai, Ahmadali v RainDance Technologies, Inc.
0830168

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. On November 2, 2007, the complainant filed a complaint, alleging in part, that he had been harassed and given poor evaluations because of his national origin and religion. On February 2, 2021, he filed an amended complaint alleging retaliation for having about discriminatory conduct. The respondent's motion to dismiss was denied without prejudice to the harassment and poor evaluation claims because there was insufficient evidence to determine whether the claims were untimely or part of a pattern. The motion to dismiss the amended claim was granted as untimely because it alleged a new and different cause of action.

Bromley, 10/10/2012
Pullicino, Laura v Pelham Sloane, Inc.
0920214

Hearing in damages. Responded defaulted for failure to appear and for failure to file and answer. The complainant alleged that she was terminated from her employment because of her disability. The complainant awarded $76,793 in backpay, unreimbursed medical expenses and pre- and post-judgment interest. Respondent further order to pay $44,729 to the state representing unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Bromley, 01/10/2013
Puryear, Brenda v Echo Hose Ambulance and the City of Shelton
1130518

Motion to strike. Complainant alleged that the respondents discriminated against her on the basis of her race and color. *Held*: motion granted. There was no employment relationship as the complainant was a volunteer, not an employee.

Bromley, 02/01/2013
Sokolowski, Andrea J.R. v Trinity Christian School
1110391

Motion to dismiss. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss the complaint. The respondent contends that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the ministerial exception under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Held*: motion denied as the ministerial exception is an affirmative defense rather than a jurisdictional bar.

Bromley, 08/22/2013
Stephenson, Arline v Webster Bank
1110235

Ruling on motion for summary judgement re: General Statute 46a-60(a)(1) and (4) claims. *Held*: motion denied as the complainant has shown that there are genuine issues of material facts regarding the role of the complainant's protected class status in determining her priority in the reduction in force and her termination.

Bromley, 01/10/2014
Perry, Corrine v Dept. of Public Safety
0830218
Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that the respondent failed to select her as a trooper training because of her age. Held: the complainant failed to establish that the background investigator harbored and acted with discriminatory animus.

Bromley, 05/14/2014
Kaplan, David v AFSCME Council #4
121003

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent denied him a position as a legislative field organizer because of his in violation of General Statute 46a-60(a)(1) and the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA). *Held*: ADEA claim dismissed because this forum has no jurisdiction over ADEA claims. Section 46a-60(a)(1) claim dismissed because the respondent had made all its hiring selections for the available openings by the time that the complainant applied for the position.

Bromley, 05/21/2014
Planas, Felix v Joint Committee on Legislative Management and the Legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis
1210127

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant in part and for the respondent in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent (1) discriminated against him by failing to engage in an interactive process to accommodate his physical disability; (2) discriminated against him

and terminated his employment because of his disability; and (3) terminated his employment in retaliation for requesting reasonable accommodations and rejecting a non-equivalent job offer. *Held*: judgment entered in favor of the complainant on the claim that the respondent failed to reasonably accommodate his disability. The complainant demonstrated that the respondent failed to engage in the interactive process and denied him reasonable accommodations on the basis of his disability. Judgment in favor of the respondent on the discrimination and retaliation claims. The respondent was ordered to hire the complainant for the next available principal analyst or equivalent position; pay the complainant backpay in the amount of $177,958.11; pay the state $19,950 as reimbursement for unemployment compensation benefits paid to the complainant; pay the complainant pre- and post-judgment interest; and reimburse the complainant $17,508.60 in medical expenses.

FitzGerald, 5/14/99
Rountree, Maria S. v. Seafood Peddler
9830387

Motion to amend complaint denied. Provides criteria for amending complaints to add complainants/respondents.

FitzGerald, 6/22/99
Turner, Laurie v. Ritz Realty, Quality Towing
9920135, 9920136

Hearing in damages. Criteria for emotional distress damages. One complainant is awarded $125.00 in economic damages.

FitzGerald, 9/29/99
Maier, Martin H. v. City of Norwalk
9320024
Maier, Martin H. v. Norwalk Municipal Employees Assoc.
9320026

Final decision. Judgment for he respondents. The complainant failed to prove *prima facie* case and intentional age discrimination.

FitzGerald, 10/15/99
Callado, Orlando v. Town of Fairfield
9420437

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of age in denying him participation in its pension plan.

FitzGerald, 10/26/99
Shea, Kathleen M. v. David M. Spruance
9640243

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant failed to prove that sexual harassment was sufficiently pervasive or severe to create an abusive work environment. (2) The complainant proved retaliation claim. Although the complainant did not prove sexual harassment claim, she demonstrated good faith belief in the underlying challenged actions. The complainant proved the respondent's business reason was pretextual by showing that the reason was not worthy of credence.

FitzGerald, 11/1/99
Rose, Sheron v. Payless Shoesource, Inc.
9920353

Hearing in damages. Employee terminated from employment on the basis of national origin and ancestry, and for opposing the respondent's discriminatory employment practice. The complainant was awarded front pay, backpay, and other equitable remedies.

FitzGerald, 2/28/00
Carter, Joseph v. C.N. Flagg Power, Inc.
8840227

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) termination of employment due to physical disability (cancer). The complainant proved discrimination by both the direct and inferential evidence standards. The respondent failed to show a bona fide occupational qualification and the complainant showed that the respondent's claims of essential job function were not worthy of credence; and (2) the complainant proved that the respondent aided and abetted in his termination.

FitzGerald, 3/20/00
Scott, Juliet v. Robert Jemison
9950020

Hearing in damages. The complainant's motion for default for failure to file an answer was granted. The respondent's motions to dismiss and set aside default were denied. Case proceeded to a hearing in damages. The complainant was awarded $6,000 for emotional distress and $25,296.44 for attorney's fees and costs. The complainant alleged her landlord physically and verbally assaulted and harassed her, denied her equal services, and threatened her with eviction in violation of General Statutes § 46a-64c(a)(2) and (3) on the basis of her race and color. She also alleged retaliation for the filing of her complaint in violation of § 46a-60(a)(4).

FitzGerald, 4/6/00
Jankowski, Laurence v. City of Meriden
9730288

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant, a firefighter, alleged a violation of General Statutes § 46a-60(a) on the basis of age (65) when the respondent involuntarily retired him under its mandatory retirement policy. Held*:* The respondent's mandatory retirement age of 65 for its firefighters is a per se statutory bona fide occupational qualification under §§ 7-430 and 46a-60(b)(1)(C). The complaint is dismissed.

FitzGerald, 4/24/00
Flood, Robert v. American Can Company
8220420

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was the victim of age discrimination that occurred when the respondent, undergoing a reduction in force, failed to transfer the complainant into a lateral job position. Held*:* the complainant failed to prove his prima facie case, that the respondent's reason was pretextual, and that he was the victim of intentional age discrimination.

FitzGerald, 8/18/00
Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut
9730257

Motion to dismiss a portion of the complaint that was incorporated by an amendment is granted. The amendment alleges essentially the same facts as a subsequent complaint filed by the complainant against the respondent. Because the complainant obtained a release of jurisdiction under §§ 46a-100 and –101 of the subsequent complaint, General Statutes § 46a-101(d) waives the commission's jurisdiction as to allegations for which the release was obtained, proscribes the commission from continuing to prosecute the allegations, and requires the dismissal of the allegations in whatever form the allegations may take.

FitzGerald, 9/15/00
Doyle, Claire T. v. State of Connecticut
9730257

Motion to dismiss granted. The commission moved for an administrative dismissal pursuant to a request by the complainant for a release of jurisdiction.

FitzGerald, 2/1/01
Pingle, V.R. Reddi v. Dept. of Environmental Protection
9910114

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated at the end of his probationary period because of his national origin, color, and ancestry. Held*:* (1) the complainant offered no direct evidence of discriminatory motivation; (2) the complainant also did not show, under the McDonnell Douglas-Burdine analysis that he was qualified for the position, circumstances giving rise to an inference of discrimination, or that the respondent's articulated legitimate business reason was a pretext for discrimination or otherwise lacking in credibility.

FitzGerald, 2/5/01
Okonkwo, Francis v. Bidwell Healthcare Center
9940144

Motion to dismiss denied in part, granted in part. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction based on reasonable cause findings. The respondent claimed that the investigator (1) found no reasonable cause to believe that the complainant had been sexually harassed; and (2) improperly found reasonable cause for an allegation, disparate treatment, not alleged in the complaint. Held*:* (1) motion granted as to the sexual harassment claim because the investigator concluded that the investigation did not support the complainant's allegations of sexual harassment; and (2) denied as to the disparate treatment claim because the complaint alleged sufficient facts to put the respondent on notice that the allegation would reasonably fall within the scope of the investigation.

FitzGerald, 4/26/01
Charette, Lisa v. Dept. of Social Services
9810371, 9810581

Final decision. Judgment for the he respondents. The complainant alleged harassment based on disability, retaliation, sexual harassment, and failure to provide reasonable accommodation for her disability. Held: (1) Upon motion to dismiss by the respondents for lack of jurisdiction, the allegations for which no reasonable cause was found (harassment based on disability and retaliation) were dismissed at the commencement of the public hearing. (2) The sexual harassment allegation was dismissed. Evidence alleging the conduct occurred was not credible. Alternatively, the conduct, even if it occurred, did not rise to the level of actionable harassment. Also, the complainant unreasonably failed to utilize the employer's complaint procedure and to cooperate in the employer's investigation. (3) The allegation of failure to provide reasonable accommodation was dismissed. Reasonable accommodation is required under state antidiscrimination law. The complainant rejected the respondents' offer of a reasonable accommodation relative to the complainant's arrive time to work. The complainant failed to participate in the requisite good faith interactive process to determine the necessity of the requested private office, job restructuring, and special light bulbs.

FitzGerald, 7/27/01
Smith, Alex v. Tony Lee d/b/a Better Built Transmissions
0130212

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged racial discrimination by his employer resulting in disparate treatment, hostile work environment, and constructive discharge. The complainant was awarded $48,496 in back pay and front pay, together with prejudgment and postjudgment compounded interest.

FitzGerald, 1/04/02
Bernd, Robert (9710052); *Bielanski, John* (9710053) *& Perry, Richard* (9710063) *v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.*

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) whether the complainant applied for a position is a question of fact; (2) the public hearing is not an opportunity to challenge the adequacy of precertification investigation; (3) commission has jurisdiction to adjudicate ADEA claims; (4) failure of investigator to comply with "date certain" for issuance of reasonable cause finding pursuant to General Statutes § 46a-82 does not result in the dismissal of the complaint; (5) complaint is not necessarily preempted by Labor Management Act.

FitzGerald, 4/22/02 (on remand)
Aguiar, Deborah v. Nancy and Ralph Frenzilli
9850105

Motion to set aside default denied with a hearing in damages to be scheduled. Following the entry of a default and a hearing in damages, the commission and complainant brought an enforcement action in Superior Court. The case was remanded with instructions to hold a hearing on setting aside the default and a hearing in damages. The respondents lacked both a good defense and/or reasonable cause for failure to timely raise their defense.

FitzGerald, 6/4/02
Kondratowicz, Stephen v. Pleasant Valley Mobile Home Park
0250051

Motion to amend complaint granted. The commission's motion granted to amend complaint adding three respondents and an additional act of retaliation. The commission's motion was timely filed, no showing of prejudice to he respondents, and the additional respondents will enable a complete determination of the issues.

FitzGerald, 7/1/02
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford
0010273
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: (1) The complainant established that she was discriminated against in promotional opportunities on the basis of her race. The respondent's articulated non-discriminatory reason found to be pretextual. The discrimination constituted a continuing violation. The complainant's failure to formally apply for a promotion excused as her application would have been a futile. The complainant is awarded back pay and a promotion retroactive to September 13, 1998. (2) The complainant's claim of discrimination based upon her disability was dismissed.

FitzGerald, 7/31/02
Walley, Terry v. Dept. of Correction
0020470

Motion to amend the complaint to add a claim of retaliation denied. The proposed amendment repeated allegations of retaliation contained in a subsequent complaint filed by the complainant. This subsequent complaint was dismissed by the investigator who found that the allegations of retaliation were not supported by the record. The commission then issued a release of its jurisdiction over the subsequent complaint and the allegations therein.

FitzGerald, 8/30/02
Ward, Carol v. Black Point Beach Club Association, Inc.
0150047
(following appeal, stipulated judgment)

Final decision. Held: The complainant established that she was physically disabled, the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was aware of her disability, her request for a variance to attach her detached garage to her house was a reasonable accommodation and the ZBA denied the request. She also established that the denial was a continuing violation based upon the ZBA's ongoing, and incorrect, policy that federal and state disability/fair housing laws do not supersede zoning restrictions. The ZBA failed to establish that the complainant's proposed accommodation was unreasonable. The complainant failed to engage in good faith, interactive dialogue with the respondents on alternative locations for the construction of her garage that would have reasonably accommodated her disability without requiring a variance. The ZBA was ordered to grant the complainant a variance to attach the garage to her house. The complainant's request for emotional distress and attorney's fees was denied.

FitzGerald, 12/02/02
Schoen, Sandra J. v. Grace Christian School 0120163
(on appeal, remanded by stipulation)

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment, harassed her, and discriminated against her in the terms and conditions of her employment in violation of Title VII and §§ 46a-60(a)(1) and 46a-60(a)(4) in retaliation for her refusal to ask her minister if he was a homosexual. Ruling: the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction because sexual orientation is not an enumerated protected class within Title VII or § 46a-60(a)(1), opposing a discriminatory employment practice is not protected by § 46a-81c, the respondent is exempt under § 46a-81p from § 46a-81c, and/or there is no employment relationship between the respondent and the complainant's minister.

FitzGerald, 3/12/03
Haley, Mary v. City of Hartford
0010273

Supplement to final decision. Itemization of monetary damages.

FitzGerald, 04/11/03
Negron, Lishka v. DSMA Enterprises
0110448

Motion to dismiss the complainant because of the complainant's failure to appear at a hearing conference was granted. Section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies and case law authorize the presiding referee to dismiss a complaint for the complainant's failure to attend a hearing or conference without just cause. Neither the commission nor the complainant offered any reason for the complainant's absence. The attendance of counsel for the commission is not an adequate substitute for the presence of the complainant, who is an independent party not represented by the commission.

FitzGerald, 4/29/03
Slootskin, Inessa v. John Brown Engineers & Construction, Inc.
9320176

Final decision after remand. The final decision was issued by the hearing officer in 1999. On appeal, the matter was remanded as to damages. On remand, the case was reassigned to a human rights referee who awarded front pay, prejudgment and post-judgment interest, and additional back pay and fringe benefits.

FitzGerald, 08/07/03
L'Annunziata, Paul v. New Horizons Learning Center
0210153

Motion to amend complaint granted. Complaint may be amended to change a date and to add he respondent's parent corporation as a respondent.

FitzGerald, 08/07/03
Abildgaard, William v. New Horizons Computer Learning Center
0110495

Motion to amend complaint granted. Complaint may be amended to correct an address, change a date and to add he respondent's parent corporation as a respondent.

FitzGerald, 05/10/04
Blinkoff, Holly v. City of Torrington
9530406
(remanded by Court of Appeals)

Motion for summary judgment granted and the case dismissed. The complainant filed her complaint with the commission in 1995. In 1997, the commission's motion for stay was granted because the complainant had filed an action in federal court in which she raised the same state discrimination claims appearing in her CHRO complaint. In the federal action, the complainant's state claims were dismissed because she failed to obtain a release from the commission. Held: The complainant had an adequate opportunity to have her state claims

adjudicated in federal court. The federal dismissal of her state discrimination claims was due to her own voluntary decision either not to proceed with those claims in federal court and/or not to seek a release from the commission.

FitzGerald, 05/25/04
Bray-Faulks, Carla v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc.
0210354

Motion to dismiss is denied and the complaint is remanded to the investigator to attempt conciliation. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss the complaint in its entirety because the investigator did not attempt conciliation prior to her certification of the complaint. The respondent claimed that § 46a-83(f) mandates that an investigator attempt conciliation, and that the investigator's failure in this case to attempt conciliation resulted in the commission losing subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint. Held: (1) an attempt to conciliate is mandatory under § 46a-83(f), (2) this statutory requirement to attempt conciliation is a condition precedent to certification and public hearing, not an issue of subject matter jurisdiction; and (3) because subject matter jurisdiction is not lost if the attempt at conciliation is held more than 50 days after a finding of reasonable cause [see § 46a-82e(a)], the complaint is remanded to the investigator to attempt conciliation, and, if conciliation is unsuccessful, to then certify the complaint for public hearing. As the complaint is being remanded, the respondent's arguments to dismiss portions of the complaint as untimely need not be addressed at this time.

FitzGerald, 6/8/04
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services
0220394

Motion in limine denied for failure to explain its legal position and to provide supporting documentation and affidavits.

FitzGerald, 06/28/04
Blinkoff Holly v. City of Torrington
9530406

On June 7, 2004, the commission filed a motion for articulation of the May 10, 2004 order dismissing the complaint. Ruling: the order of dismissal adequately articulated the basis for the dismissal.

FitzGerald, 7/6/04
Payton, Meredith v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addiction Services
0220394

Motion to dismiss instead treated where appropriate as a motion for summary judgment and a motion to strike, granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against him on the basis of religion. The complainant did not establish an adverse employment action or that similarly situated co-workers were being treated differently. The complainant's proposed relief would have required the respondent to violate the Establishment Clauses of the federal and state constitutions.

FitzGerald, 12/27/04
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University
0140203

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment because of her sex, her disability, and in retaliation for her requesting accommodations for her disability. Held*:* the commission and the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's articulated business reason was a pretext for discrimination. Also, a violation of Title VII or the Rehabilitation Act is a violation of § 46a-58(a) and would entitle the commission and the complainant to the remedies available under § 46a-86(c).

FitzGerald, 01/28/05
Kennedy, Valerie v. Eastern Connecticut State University
0140203

Motion to reconsider the final decision denied.

FitzGerald, 08/02/05
McWeeny, Robert v. City of Hartford
0410314
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The respondents paid a pension to the complainant's spouse, a retired city employee. When the complainant's spouse died, the respondents paid a spousal allowance to the complainant, who had never been employed by the respondents. The respondents terminated the spousal allowance upon the complainant's remarriage. The complainant alleged that the termination of the allowance constituted discrimination against him on the basis of his marital status. There was no evidence that the respondents had discriminated against the employed spouse. Held: (1) employee status is a prerequisite to maintaining a complaint of employment discrimination and (2) complaint dismissed because the complainant never had employee status with any of the respondents.

FitzGerald, 08/29/05
Davis, Keith A. v. Mama Bears LLC
0430103

Motion to amend the complaint to add a respondent denied without prejudice because there was no verification that the motion and proposed amendment had been received by the proposed respondent. As a matter of due process, the proposed respondent is entitled to notice and opportunity to be heard on the motion.

FitzGerald, 08/31/05
Dexter, Frank v. Dept. of Correction
0320165

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The respondent terminated the complainant's employment as a correction officer because he violated the administrative directive against undue familiarity with inmates by using his personal cell phone to make calls on behalf of inmates. The complainant, an African-American, alleged that the respondent did not terminate non-African Americans who had been cited for undue familiarity. Held: the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case because of his repeated violations of the administrative directive and because the non-African American correction officers to whom he compared himself were not similarly situated as their conduct were not as severe as the complainant's. Even if the prima facie elements were established, the complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent's business reason was a pretext for actual discrimination.

FitzGerald, 09/07/05
Crebase, John v. Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals
0330171

Motion for sanctions granted. The respondent moved that the complainant be sanctioned for failure to comply with the presiding human rights referee's order to produce documents. The complainant is sanctioned as follows: (1) it is established that the respondent did not terminate the complainant's employment because of his mental disorder; (2) no evidence shall be introduced that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his mental disorder and (3) no evidence shall be introduced that the complainant has a mental disorder.

FitzGerald, 11/15/05
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294

Amended ruling re: the respondent's motion to vacate. The respondent requested reconsideration of an order granting the commission's motion to compel. The respondent claimed that producing the documents would violate the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The respondent's motion denied as the requested documents were within statutory exceptions.

FitzGerald, 11/18/05
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
0430307

Motion to amend the complaint to add claims of retaliation and national origin discrimination denied. The complaint alleged that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his age. The allegations of retaliation and national origin discrimination had not been alleged in the complaint, investigated by the commission during or raised by the complainant during the pre-certification factfinding investigation, or supported by any factual findings in the reasonable cause finding. The motion is denied because the requirement under § 46a-83, that the investigator list the factual findings on whether there is reasonable cause to believe that retaliation and national origin discrimination occurred, is a condition precedent to a hearing on those allegations.

FitzGerald, 11/28/05
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc.
0440130
(stipulated agreement on appeal)

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged he was terminated because of his age. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear at the hearing conference and for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded back pay of $35,535.99 and additional relief.

FitzGerald, 12/5/05
Garceau, Mary Beth v Yale University
0530073

Motion to compel granted in part. Inter alia, the respondent, pursuant to General Statutes § 31-128f (2), was ordered to produce disciplinary records.

FitzGerald, 12/12/05
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294

Motion for sanctions and to dismiss the complaint granted in part, denied in part. The complainant failed to comply with order to produce documents responsive to the respondent's production request. Because the requested documents were not relevant to the parties' burden of proof as to whether a discriminatory act occurred, the complaint was not dismissed. Because the requested documents were relevant as to the impact of the alleged discriminatory act on the complainant as his claim for emotional damages, the complainant and the commission are prohibited from introducing any oral or documentary evidence that the complainant sought and/or received treatment for emotional distress as a result of the alleged discriminatory act and they are prohibited from introducing any oral or documentary evidence of the impact the alleged discriminatory act had on the complainant's subsequent educational and employment performance after he withdrew from Cheshire High School.

FitzGerald, 12/30/05
Ramseur, Cecil v. Colonial Chimney & Masonry, Inc.
0440130
(stipulated agreement on appeal)

Motions to stay, to reconsider back pay calculation and to reopen default judgment were denied. Back pay was properly calculated from date of discriminatory termination to date of judgment, less mitigation. The length of the complainant's employment with the respondent and his separation from subsequent employment do not preclude the accrual of back pay. The respondent failed to show mistake, accident or other reasonable cause to justify setting aside the default judgment.

FitzGerald, 01/23/06
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
0430307

Motion to compel denied for failure to articulate an explanation of how the requested documents were relevant and material to the facts of the case.

FitzGerald, 01/23/06
Baker, Michael v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.
0430307

Motion to compel denied. The respondent's requested documents to contest the commission's finding of reasonable cause. However, the public hearing is a hearing on the merits and not an appeal of the commission's pre-certification processing of the complaint. General Statutes § 46a-84 (b).

FitzGerald, 07/12/06
Crebase, John v. Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
0330171
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant established that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) (Title VII) and 46a-60 (a) when it terminated his employment because of his age, sex and mental disability. The complainant was awarded damages including two years of back pay, reinstatement, pre-and post-judgment interest, and emotional distress.

FitzGerald, 07/26/06
Saex, Randall v. Wireless Retail, Inc.
0410175

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear at a settlement conference. The complainant alleged, in part, that the respondent harassed him and terminated his employment because of his age, religion and sex. The complainant was awarded damages including back pay, front pay, reimbursement of medical expenses, pre- and post-judgment interest, and emotional distress.

FitzGerald, 10/16/06
Azam, Qazi v. Yale University
0430623

Motion to compel granted in part. Inter alia, the respondent, pursuant to General Statutes § 31-128f (2), was ordered to produce documents submitted by the successful candidates for the job positions the complainant had applied for.

FitzGerald, 02/09/07
Genovese, Lisa v. Ultimate Billiards
0530337

Hearing in damages. The executive director defaulted the respondent for failing to respond to the commission's pre-certification interrogatories (General Statutes § 46a-54). The complainant was awarded back pay, front pay, reimbursement of medical costs that would have been paid through the respondent's employee medical benefit package, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

FitzGerald, 06/29/07
Cosme, Edgardo v. Sunrise Estates, LLC
0510210

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: the respondent failed to reasonably accommodate the complainant's mental disability; discriminated against the complainant in the terms, conditions and privileges of his employment because of his mental disability; and terminated his employment because of his mental disability. The complainant awarded relief including $36,696 in back pay; $45,136 in front pay (four years); and pre- and post-judgment interest.

FitzGerald, 07/17/07
Blinkoff, Holly v City of Torrington
9530406

Motion to dismiss denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent retaliated against her for filing a complaint with the commission. The respondent moved to dismiss arguing that no employment relationship existed between the complainant and the respondent. Held: under § 46a-60 (a) (4), a claim for retaliation can arise either from an employment relationship or from the filing of a complaint with the commission.

FitzGerald, 03/19/08
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v Donna & David Vahlstrom
0750080

Motion to reopen public hearing denied. The public hearing was held on February 20, 2008 and February 26, 2008. The respondents, represented by counsel, did not testify at the public hearing because, although they were listed on the commission's proposed witness list, the commission chose not to call them and because they were not listed on their own witness list. On March 4, 2008, the respondents moved to re-open the hearing to permit them to testify. Held*:* General Statute § 4-177c and §§ 46a-54-78a and 46a-54-90a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies provide that a party's participation in a contested case is a reasonable opportunity subject to oversight by the presiding referee, not an unrestricted right. The hearing conference summary and order of May 1, 2007 placed all parties on clear and unequivocal notice that they were to file and serve a list of the party's proposed witnesses and that witnesses not listed, except for impeachment and rebuttal, may not be permitted to testify except for good cause shown. The respondents filed a witness list but did not list themselves as witnesses and failed to file a motion to amend their list to include themselves. The requirement that all potential witnesses, including parties, be identified on the proffering party's witness list is not unreasonable and the respondents did not show that good cause existed for their failures to include themselves on their witness list.

FitzGerald, 4/15/08
Ferri, Susan v Darien Barber Shop
0520471

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent claimed the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the complaint was brought against a trade name. Held: Courts have held that a trade name may be named as a defendant in an action. Further, by entering an appearance, an attorney acknowledges that the party named on the appearance form is an accurate legal designation of the party for purposes of the trial

FitzGerald, 6/6/08
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom
0750080

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that the respondents, her neighbors, discriminated against her on the basis of her color and ancestry and created a hostile housing environment in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1982, Title VIII and General Statutes SS 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64c (a) (9). Held: (1) the respondents did not violate 42 U.S.C. § 1982, Title VIII or § 46a-58 (a) because they did not engage in violence or threaten violence; (2) § 46a-64c (9) prohibits discriminatory interference with any person in the person's post-acquisition exercise or enjoyment of his or her property. Prohibited interference includes severe, pervasive and grossly offensive nonviolent conduct directed against a person because of his or her protected status; (3) members of a household have a cause of action for actual interference in their own exercise and enjoyment of their property against a neighbor for the neighbor's severe, pervasive and grossly offensive nonviolent conduct toward any member of the household because of the member's protected status; and (4) the commission failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents' conduct toward the complainant and her sons was (a) because of the complainant's race or ancestry and (b) sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the complainant's living conditions and to create a hostile housing environment for the complainant.

FitzGerald, 8/25/08
Blinkoff, Holly v City of Torrington
9530406

Final decision. The commission and the complainant established by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents retaliated against the complainant (1) in 1995 when they filed a lawsuit against her seeking injunctive relief and (2) when they scheduled her special exceptions permit application in January 1997 rather than December 1996. Nevertheless, no monetary damages are awarded as the commission and the complainant failed to establish that these retaliatory actions resulted in monetary damages to the complainant.

FitzGerald, 10/16/08
Ocana, Holger v. Metro-North Railroad Co.
0630645
(appeal dismissed)

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) and also Title VII and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act when it failed to promote him because of his age and national origin. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss claiming that the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The respondent argued that it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, organized under the laws of the State of New York. As a result of a compact between Connecticut and New York, codified in General Statutes §§ 16-343 and 16-344, the respondent operates a commuter rail service in Connecticut and is exempted by

Connecticut's legislature from state regulation, including exemption from Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws.

Held: the respondent is in the business of providing mass transportation and railroad service pursuant to the Connecticut – New York compact and is the beneficiary of the exemption in § 16-344 (a). Its promotion of employees involved in its mass transportation and railroad service is within its routine and normal business operations. Based on the Connecticut Supreme Court's decision in *Greenwich v Connecticut Transportation Authority*, 166 Conn. 337(1974), the exemption in § 16-344 (a) applies to this case. Therefore, the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction of this claim and the motion to dismiss is granted.

FitzGerald, 10/16/08
Vidal, Robert v. Metro-North Railroad Co.
0630646
(appeal dismissed)

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it failed to promote him because of his national origin and color. The respondent filed a motion to dismiss claiming that the commission lacked subject matter jurisdiction. The respondent argued that it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, organized under the laws of the State of New York. As a result of a compact between Connecticut and New York, codified in General Statutes §§ 16-343 and 16-344, the respondent operates a commuter rail service in Connecticut and is exempted by Connecticut's legislature from state regulation, including exemption from Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws.

Held: the respondent is in the business of providing mass transportation and railroad service pursuant to the Connecticut – New York compact and is the beneficiary of the exemption in § 16-344 (a). Its promotion of employees involved in its mass transportation and railroad service is within its routine and normal business operations. Based on the Connecticut Supreme Court's decision in *Greenwich v Connecticut Transportation Authority*, 166 Conn. 337 (1974), the exemption in § 16-344 (a) applies to this case. Therefore, the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction of this claim and the motion to dismiss is granted.

FitzGerald, 12/10/08
Andrees, JoAnn v. Raymond & Sylvia Rinaldi
0650116

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. The complainant alleged that the respondents discriminated against her in violation of 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1982 and Title VIII and also General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64c (a) (1) and (2) when they refused to rent a condominium unit to her because of her race and color. Held: The commission and the complainant cannot establish their prima facie case and/or cannot establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondents intentionally discriminated against the complainant because of her race and color because they failed to provide credible persuasive evidence that the respondents knew the complainant was black.

FitzGerald, 3/18/09
Caruso, Jr., John v. Western Connecticut State University
0620214

Motion to dismiss granted in part. The complainant is employed by the respondent as a professor. On November 3, 2005, he filed an affidavit with the commission alleging that because of his participation on behalf of his wife's discrimination claim against the respondent, the respondent thereafter retaliated against him. The complainant identified three retaliatory acts, one of which occurred in 2004. (The 2004 retaliatory act was also included in a prior affidavit the complainant had filed with the commission in 2004. The commission dismissed the 2004 affidavit after finding no reasonable cause). Following an unsuccessful conciliation conference on December 12, 2008, the complainant filed an amended affidavit that included as a fourth alleged retaliatory act a failure to hire claim that arose in 2005. Held: the 2004 allegation was dismissed as untimely filed and as precluded by the res judicata effect of the commission's dismissal of the 2004 complaint. The 2005 failure to hire claim was not saved by the "relate back" doctrine and was dismissed as untimely.

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142

"Motion to preclude relitigation of factual findings in *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* and to preclude relitigation of certain legal issues as a result of the *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* decision" is denied. The respondent argued that the doctrine of collateral estoppel should apply so as to preclude the relitigation of the factual and legal findings determined in connection with the final decision issued in *O'Halloran*. Collateral estoppel is inapplicable for at least three reasons. First, the presiding referee concluded that O'Halloran did not prove discrimination; he did not conclude that the respondent did not discriminate. Second, in *O'Halloran*, the presiding referee specifically noted that: he did not intend his findings in *O'Halloran* to be applied to the merits of this case. Finally, under the facts of this case, the policies underlying collateral estoppel and the anti-discrimination statutes favor not applying collateral estoppel.

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141

"Motion to preclude relitigation of factual findings in *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* and to preclude relitigation of certain legal issues as a result of the *O'Halloran v. Fairfield* decision" is denied. The respondent argued that the doctrine of collateral estoppel should apply so as to preclude the relitigation of the factual and legal findings determined in connection with the final decision issued in *O'Halloran*. Collateral estoppel is inapplicable for at least three reasons. First, the presiding referee concluded that O'Halloran did not prove discrimination; he did not conclude that the respondent did not discriminate. Second, in *O'Halloran*, the presiding referee specifically noted that: he did not intend his findings in *O'Halloran* to be applied to

the merits of this case. Finally, under the facts of this case, the policies underlying collateral estoppel and the anti-discrimination statutes favor not applying collateral estoppel.

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142

Motion in limine is granted to preclude evidence of qualifications unknown to the decision-maker at the time of the hiring decision. Under the "after-acquired evidence" doctrine, information that was unknown to the decision-maker at the time he made his decision could not have influenced his decision and, therefore, is irrelevant as to his motivation in choosing whom to hire.

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141

Motion in limine is granted to preclude evidence of qualifications unknown to the decision-maker at the time of the hiring decision. Under the "after-acquired evidence" doctrine, information that was unknown to the decision-maker at the time he made his decision could not have influenced his decision and, therefore, is irrelevant as to his motivation in choosing whom to hire.

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142

Motion in limine seeking to preclude the introduction of evidence regarding any emotional distress damages is denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it refused to hire her for the position of zoning inspector because of her sex. Although emotional distress damages are not available for a violation of § 46a-60, the complainant's damage claims also arise from the respondent's alleged unlawful practices under Title VII, which would constitute a violation of § 46a-58 (a) and afford the complainant the relief, including emotional distress damages, available under General Statute § 46a-86 (c).

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141

Motion in limine seeking to preclude the introduction of evidence regarding any emotional distress damages is denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) when it refused to hire her for the position of zoning inspector because of her sex. Although emotional distress damages are not available for a violation of § 46a-60, the complainant's damage claims also arise from the respondent's alleged unlawful practices under Title VII, which would constitute a violation of

§ 46a-58 (a) and afford the complainant the relief, including emotional distress damages, available under General Statute § 46a-86 (c).

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142

Motion for reconsideration of the ruling sustaining the respondent's in limine objection to the testimony of Josephine O'Halloran is denied. First, as proffered by the commission, O'Halloran's proposed testimony offered no obvious or logical connection to the issue of the respondent's alleged discriminatory conduct toward the complainant. Second, O'Halloran is not a "similarly situated" witness. Third, the commission provided no specific as to the discriminatory treatment of the complainant that O'Halloran personally observed and also provided no specific information as to what testimony O'Halloran could corroborate that would both need corroboration and also not be unduly repetitious.

FitzGerald, 06/30/09
Gabriel, Betty v. Town of Fairfield
0620141

Motion for reconsideration of the ruling sustaining the respondent's in limine objection to the testimony of Josephine O'Halloran is denied. First, as proffered by the commission, O'Halloran's proposed testimony offered no obvious or logical connection to the issue of the respondent's alleged discriminatory conduct toward the complainant. Second, O'Halloran is not a "similarly situated" witness. Third, the commission provided no specific as to the discriminatory treatment of the complainant that O'Halloran personally observed and also provided no specific information as to what testimony O'Halloran could corroborate that would both need corroboration and also not be unduly repetitious.

FitzGerald, 12/03/09
Milton, Michele v. Pulte Homes, Inc.
0630188
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. The complainant alleged that the respondent, her former employer, violated General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a) and 46a-60 (a) (1) and Title VII when she was harassed, received unequal pay and was subsequently terminated because of her age and sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that that the complainant was harassed or terminated because of her sex or her age. The commission, though, did establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the complainant received less compensation than similarly situated non-basis sales managers because of her sex and/or age and relief awarded.

FitzGerald, 11/18/09
Young, Claude v. City of Stamford Police Dept.
0720418

Motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction denied. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated § 46a-58 (a) and 46a-64 and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment when he was subjected to excessive use of force, police brutality, verbally abusive language and racial slurs. Held: the respondent is a public accommodation for purposes of § 46a-64, and the complaint may be amended to allege additional facts to show an equal protection violation enforceable through § 46a-58 (a).

FitzGerald, 12/28/09
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant was one of four applicants (three females and one male) for the position of zoning inspector. The respondent hired the male applicant for the position. The complainant alleged that she was not hired because of her sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of her sex when it did not hire her for the position of zoning inspector.

FitzGerald, 12/28/09
Carlson, Rose Ann v. Town of Fairfield
0620142

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant was one of four applicants (three females and one male) for the position of zoning inspector. The respondent hired the male applicant for the position. The complainant alleged that she was not hired because of her sex. Held: the commission did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent discriminated against the complainant on the basis of her sex when it did not hire her for the position of zoning inspector.

FitzGerald, 06/28/10
Pappy, John v. Southern Connecticut State University
0730288

Motion to compel denied. The respondent sought all medical records from 1997 to date because the complainant claims damages for emotional distress. The respondent also sought personnel records from the complainant's employers prior to the respondent hiring the complainant in 1989. Ruling: (1) the medical records are exempt from disclosure because the complainant is alleging "garden variety" emotional distress, and psychological and mental conditions are not elements in a claim for garden variety emotional distress and (2) employment records from over twenty years ago are not relevant and material to the

employment conditions alleged by the complainant or to the defenses raised by the respondent in its answer.

FitzGerald, 06/28/10
Standard, Tracy A. v. Esposito Design Associates, Inc.
0820445

Objection to defendant corporation proceeding pro se overruled. When the attorney for the respondent corporation withdrew its appearance, the non-lawyer officer of the corporation filed notice that he would be proceeding on behalf of the corporation. The commission's objection to the respondent appearing pro se is overruled as the commission's regulations permit a respondent to appear pro se in an administrative proceeding.

FitzGerald, 7/23/10
Nemeth, Sandor v Westport Big & Tall, Inc
0920337
(remand by agreement)

The presiding referee dismissed the complaint sua sponte for the complainant's failure to appear. Neither the complainant nor his attorney attended the hearing conference.

FitzGerald, 09/13/10
Ellis, John v. ACE International (ACE American Ins. Co.)
0620473

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. The complainant's § 46a-58 (a), Title VII retaliation and ADEA claims dismissed. Commission lacks jurisdiction because retaliation and age are not enumerated as protected bases under § 46a-58 (a). Motion dismissed as to the complainant's § 46a-60 (a) (4) retaliation claim as (1) the claim is not time-barred and (2) whether the alleged acts would dissuade a reasonable worker from making or supporting a charge of discrimination is an evidentiary matter not a jurisdictional defect.

FitzGerald, 10/12/10
Pappy, John v. Southern Connecticut State University
0730288

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Title VII and §§ 46a-58 (a) (1) and (4), and 46a-60 (a) and 46a-70 (a) and (e). Motion granted as to the § 46a-58 (a) retaliation claim; motion denied as to the § 46a-58 (a) race and national origin claims. Motion denied, without prejudice, as to the claim of untimeliness.

FitzGerald, 10/25/10
Ellis, John v. ACE International (ACE American Ins. Co.)
0620473

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent asserted lack of subject matter jurisdiction, lack of personal jurisdiction and improper extraterritorial application of state's anti-discrimination laws. Held: (1) the commission has subject matter jurisdiction under § 46a-60 over a claim that an employee was terminated because of his age an in retaliation for his opposition to discriminatory employment practices; (2) a decision made in Connecticut that has extraterritorial effect does not make the application of the law extraterritorial and Connecticut's anti-discrimination laws may, in some cases be applied extraterritorially; and, (3) the commission and the complainant established that the commission's exercise of personal jurisdiction satisfies statutory and constitutional requirements.

FitzGerald, 12/29/2021
Rowe, CarolAnne v Allied World Assurance Company
1810381

The respondent's motion for sanctions for failing to comply with an order to produce documents was granted. Sanctions included exclusion of documents and testimony.

FitzGerald, 02/18/2022
Gallant, Michelle v. Torrad Assoc. LLC.
1830431

The complainant filed a complaint alleging, in part, that her son had been denied medical services in retaliation for the child's father having previously filed a discrimination complaint with the commission. The respondent moved to dismiss arguing, in part, that the child was not within the zone of interests under the statutes. *Held:* motion denied. General Statutes §§ 46a-60(b)(4) and 46a-64 provide a cause of action for associational discrimination.

Giliberto, 2/19/99
Brown, Kim v. Olsten Services, Inc.
9920046
(appeal dismissed 11/10/99, following appeal, stipulated judgment)

Motion to open default granted. Held*:* (1) human rights referee have authority at default hearing to open default entered by acting executive director and (2) matter referred back to investigative office.

Giliberto, 7/15/99
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)

Motion to dismiss granted in part. Held: (1) the commission does not have jurisdiction over claims pursuant to §10-15c; (2) public schools are not public accommodations; (3) the commission does not have concurrent jurisdiction with the Dept of Education pursuant to §46a-58 and §46a-64(a)(2). On appeal, Superior Court vacated the referee's dismissal, found that the commission does have jurisdiction to hear complaints of discrimination against students in public schools, and remanded the case for further proceedings.

Giliberto, 7/22/99
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen
9830057

Motion to dismiss denied. Motion to amend granted in part. Held*:* (1) Complaint may be amended to correct statutory bases for discrimination; (2) General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) imposes individual liability; (3) complaint may be amended to cite in the proper respondent; and (4) claim pursuant to § 46a-60(a)(5) may not be added to the complaint.

Giliberto, 7/29/99
Volpintesta, Lou v. International Athletic Association of Basketball Officials
9910120

Hearing in damages. Part-time high school basketball referee awarded: (1) back pay (2) front pay (3) membership dues; and (4) various equitable remedies.

Giliberto, 8/17/99
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen
9830057

Motion to dismiss federal claims granted in part. Federal claims under ADEA and ADA are dismissed due to employer having less than minimum number of employees.

Giliberto, 8/20/99
DeRosa, Barbara G. v. Dr. Fredric Rosen
9830057

Motion to stay pending declaratory ruling from the commission denied. Held*:* (1) executive director cannot file motions as she is represented by the commission counsel; (2) chief human rights referee performs administrative function and cannot rule in place of presiding human rights referees; (3) human rights referees have duty to address matters in more expedient fashion than the court system; and (4) declaratory rulings are no more binding than final decisions in other contested cases and do not require halt to all potentially related proceedings.

Giliberto, 8/20/99
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction
9740163

Motion to stay pending declaratory ruling from the commission denied. Held*:* (1) executive director cannot file motions as she is represented by the commission counsel; (2) chief human rights referee performs administrative function and cannot rule in place of presiding human rights referees; (3) human rights referees have duty to address matters in more expedient fashion than the court system; and (4) declaratory rulings are no more binding than final decisions in other contested cases and do not require halt to all potentially related proceedings.

Giliberto, 9/30/99
Duarte, James v. Hamilton Standard
9610553

Motion to dismiss denied in part. Held*:* (1) The complainant alleged facts sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of disability discrimination; (2) Employers have a duty under state law to make reasonable accommodations; (3) General Statutes § 46a-58(a) does not apply to discriminatory employment practices that fall under the federal statutes; and (4) the commission does have jurisdiction over federal claims of discrimination.

Giliberto, 10/26/99
Nicolosi, Patricia v. Johnny's Pizza
9840466

Order of dismissal due to the complainant's failure to cooperate. Pro se complainant failed to attend scheduling conference and settlement conference without excuse or explanation.

Giliberto, 11/16/99
Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co.
9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069

Motion to dismiss granted in part. Held*:* (1) motion to dismiss is treated as a motion to strike; (2) § 46a-64c(a)(2) protects against discriminatory practices after the initial sale or rental transaction; (3) § 46a-64c(a)(3) does not apply solely to discrimination in advertising and includes verbal statements; (4) family members of disabled individuals are protected from discriminatory practices pursuant to § 46a-64c(a)(6)(B) and (C); (5) the discriminatory acts alleged against the respondent management company and the respondent property manager do not constitute "residential real-estate-related transactions" pursuant to § 46a-64(a)(7); and (6) white persons are protected from racial discrimination under the state and federal fair housing laws.

Giliberto, 3/9/00
Johnson, Mary L. v. Dept. of Correction
9740163

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) The complainant is an "individual with a disability" due to her physical impairments of asthma and degenerative arthritis which are found to substantially limit the major life activities of breathing and walking; (2) The complainant was not qualified to perform the essential functions of her job and therefore failed to set forth a prima facie case under the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act; (3) the complainant's impairments of asthma and degenerative arthritis meet the definition of "physically disabled" under state law and the complainant established a prima facie case under state law; (4) the respondent proved the safety defense and her physical disabilities prevent her from performing her job.

Giliberto, 3/13/00
Brown, Bradley, Sr. v. Creative Management Realty Co.
9850062, 9850063, 9850064, 9850065, 9850068, 9850069

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held*:* All of the parties failed to appear for the public hearing, therefore the complainants and the commission failed to establish a prima facie case.

Giliberto, 5/31/00
Ballard, Chillon v. Cheshire Bd. of Ed.
9830294
(rev'd and remanded by Supreme Ct)

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) General Statutes § 46a-75 does not apply to public schools; and (2) the commission through the human rights referee does not have the authority to transfer this matter to the State Board of Education. On appeal, Superior Court vacated the referee's dismissal, found that the commission does have jurisdiction to hear

complaints of discrimination against students in public schools, and remanded the case for further proceedings.

Giliberto, 7/31/00
Intagliata, Debra J. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.
9740381

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held*:* (1) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case of retaliation due to her failure to prove she complained about discriminatory employment practices and failure to prove any adverse action; and (2) The complainant failed to establish a prima facie case of gender discrimination due to her failure to prove that the male employee that replaced her was similarly situated and failure to prove any adverse action or inference of salary discrimination due to gender.

Giliberto, 9/27/00
Scarfo, Dominic C. v. Hamilton Sundstrand Corp.
9610577

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) General Statutes § 46a-58(a) encompasses ADA claims; (2) human rights referees have authority to adjudicate federal claims, including the ADA; (3) Prior adverse arbitration decision is not entitled to receive substantial weight by this tribunal and does not preclude the complainant from receiving remedies; (4) the complainant's state claims of discrimination are not preempted by § 301 of the Labor-Management Relations Act; (5) the respondent did not regard the complainant as disabled under the ADA; (6) the complainant was not entitled to reasonable accommodations under the ADA based on his "regarded as" claim; (7) General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) includes perceived disability claims; (8) the respondent did not perceive the complainant to be disabled under § 46a-60(a)(1); (9) the *McDonnell Douglas* model of analysis applies to the facts in this matter; and (10) there is no duty to provide reasonable accommodations for perceived disability claims under state law.

Giliberto, 11/15/00
Rosado, Nestor v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
0020469

Hearing in damages. Both the complainant and the respondent failed to appear. Order of relief included: (1) a cease and desist order against the respondent; and (2) the respondent was ordered to place posters, to be supplied by the commission at all of its Connecticut locations.

Kerr, 03/08/05
Sanchez, Maria v. Atlantic Communications, Corp.
0430462
Kerr, 03/08/05

Hearing in damages. The complainant filed her affidavit of discriminatory practice on March 12, 2004, alleging sexual harassment and wrongful termination (on the basis of her sex) in violation of General Statutes §§ 46a-58(a) and 46a-60(a)(1) and Title VII. The respondent was defaulted on January 5, 2005 for failure to file an answer and a hearing in damages was held on February 17, 2005. The respondent was ordered to cease and desist in further sexual harassment, to pay the complainant $8,402.70 in back pay, to reimburse the state $3, 718.00 in unemployment compensation benefits paid to the complainant, and to pay pre- and postjudgment interest on both amounts at the rate of 10% per annum.

Kerr, 12/01/05
Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7
0130607

Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part. Teacher termination matter based upon sex (female) age and religion (Methodist). Motion predicated on res judicata and collateral estoppel as a result of termination being upheld by impartial state hearing panel (General Statutes 10-151) and superior court on appeal from panel ruling. Motion granted as to claims under General Statutes 46a-60(a)(1) and the ADEA. Motion denied as to claims under General Statutes 46a—58(a) and Title VII.

Kerr, 01/04/07
Sperow, Joyce v. Regional School District No. 7 0130607

Motion for reconsideration denied. Held: The request did not meet the statutory standards warranting reconsideration and grossly mischaracterized the final decision by not recognizing that while certain of the complainant's claims were found to be barred by issue preclusion (back pay, reinstatement), others (injunctive relief) were protected by the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the matter could proceed on the limited basis authorized therein.

Kerr, 04/17/06
Maher, Stacy v. New Britain Transportation Co.
0330303

Final decision. Case dismissed. The complainant claimed discrimination as a result of her gender in her rate of pay, being passed over for promotion, being offered a promotion on lesser terms than males, having her hours reduced and being constructively discharged. The complaint was brought under CFEPA, Title Vll and the Equal Pay Act. After full hearing the complaint was dismissed for failure to establish a prima facie case as some allegations did not constitute adverse employment actions and others were under circumstances where no improper animus could be inferred.

Kerr, 06/01/06
Duncan, Clive v CT Trane
0410319

Motion to stay denied. The motion to stay was predicated on the filing of an action in federal court one month prior to the complaint's certification. The motion claimed that a stay was necessary to preserve (from the threat of preclusion) a right to a federal jury trial and to avoid duplication of effort. The motion was denied because the dual filing was at the complainant's option, preclusion issues could arise whether the stay was granted or not and because no compelling reason was advanced to indefinitely disenfranchise the commission from its statutory obligation to prosecute discrimination complaints.

Kerr, 9/12/06
DiMicco, Rosa v. Neil Roberts, Inc.
0420438

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon sexual harassment and retaliatory dismissal. The complainant was awarded back pay ($7,220), lost benefits ($3,699), emotional distress ($6,000) and prejudgment interest ($4,740).

Kerr, 11/06/06
Daniels, Jeffrey v Andre Ruellan
0550012

Final decision. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in being denied rental housing on the basis of disability and source of income. The respondent denied the claim based on disability and rebutted the source of income claim by stating that his denial was predicated on the permissible consideration of insufficient income. Held: The disability claim was dismissed for lack of evidence and judgment for the complainant was entered on the source of income claim. The formula the respondent had used to determine insufficient income was legally flawed, and could be applied so as to eliminate virtually all Section 8 applicants. The complainant was awarded $4275 plus interest for all claims (which sum included a small award for emotional distress) and complainant's counsel was awarded a discounted attorney's fee in the amount of $10,150.

Kerr, 11/16/06
DiMicco, Rosa v Neil Roberts, Inc.
0420438

Final decision on reconsideration. The complainant requested a reconsideration of the final decision dated September 12, 2006, wherein the referee declined to award attorney's fees because the complainant supplied inadequate documentation to support an award. Held: After granting the motion to reconsider, and reviewing a detailed itemized bill with proposed hourly rates, the referee awarded $10,369.39 in attorney's fees, rejecting the proposed

lodestar fee of $17,282.31 as unreasonable and out of proportion with the effort put forth and the result obtained.

Kerr, 05/03/07
Pinto, Angela v. Edith Engelhard
0550113

Final decision. The complainant alleged that she was discriminated against in being denied rental housing on the basis of her section 8 source of income, in violation of General Statutes § 46a-64c (a) (1). The respondent alleged that the denial was based on unsatisfactory credit and failing to comply with her last minute demand that the complainant provide proof of good funds for first month's rent and security two days prior to the lease inception. It was found that there was evidence of the respondent having stated that the cause of the rejection was her husband's refusal to accept the governmental involvement (in the form of section 8 paperwork and including submission of IRS form W-9) section 8 participation requires. This conclusion was supported by several exhibits (some executed by both parties), which confirmed a meeting of the minds on all rental details. The *Price Waterhouse* model was applied and it was found that the respondent did not meet her burden of establishing that she would have denied the complainant rental housing even in the absence of the complainant's section 8 source of income. The complainant was awarded $5,000 for emotional distress and an attorney's fee award was made in the amount of $10,500.

Kerr, 10/03/07
Rajtar, *Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield*
0510115

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: An arbitration panel's finding that the complainant (a police officer) had been untruthful during an investigation and subsequent disciplinary action, and a subsequent superior court ruling that the complainant could not be returned to duty by the panel as a matter of public policy, did not preclude the commission from considering whether the complainant's termination was an impermissible discriminatory act. The decision reasoned that discriminatory animus had not been considered by the town, panel or court, and that the complainant should be afforded the opportunity to establish that the finding of untruthfulness was pretext for a termination impermissibly predicated on the basis of his age. This case was distinguishable from *Sperow v. Regional School District No. 7,* CHRO No. 0130607).

Kerr, 10/03/07
Rajtar, *Donald J. v. Town of Bloomfield*
0510115
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that he had been wrongfully terminated as a police officer by the respondent on the basis of age. The respondent's decision to terminate had been set aside by an arbitration panel, which had found the complainant had been untruthful during an investigation and subsequent

disciplinary hearing but had reduced the termination to a 200-workday suspension. The complainant maintained that the charges against him, the disciplinary proceedings and his discharge were pretext for age discrimination. There was evidence of tolerated and department wide disparagement of older patrol officers, of disparate discipline predicated on age, and of an investigation of the complainant's alleged dishonesty so one sided and perfunctory as to lend substantial credence to the complainant's assertion that the disciplinary process, finding of dishonesty and resultant termination were but pretext for a wrongful termination predicated on age. The complainant was awarded $80,369.34 for back pay, accrued time in the amount of 687.97 hours, $19,792. for medical expenses incurred as a result of loss of insurance, prejudgment interest from January 9, 2006, post judgment interest and other equitable relief.

Kerr, 11/08/07
Rajtar, Donald J. v Town of Bloomfield
0510115
(appeal withdrawn)

Petitions for reconsideration. The respondent, the complainant and the commission filed petitions to reconsider. The respondent's petition to reconsider the earlier denial of its motion to dismiss was denied. The complainant's and respondent's petitions to reconsider the final decision were granted. Held: The final decision was affirmed and clarified to provide that the complainant be reinstated to full duty as a Bloomfield officer and that the final decision be implemented independent of any disposition in *Town of Bloomfield v. United Electrical Radio & Machine Workers of America*, 2006 WL 3491719 (Conn. Super.) because that matter is proceeding on a finding that the complainant (Rajtar) had been untruthful, which finding was rejected in the final decision as pretext advanced to impermissibly justify a termination effectuated because of age discrimination.

Kerr, 4/10/08
Recupero, Guy v. L.G. Defelice, Inc.
0530022

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon unlawful dismissal based upon mental disability (bipolar disorder). After hearing held damages awarded under CFEPA in the amount of $164,059.93, plus prejudgment interest, post judgment interest and $12,703 in reimbursement of unemployment compensation payments received. Request for front pay award denied.

Kerr, 6/12/08
Couture, Alan v. Waterbury Republican
0630390
(on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)

Motion to dismiss granted. Held: The respondent newspaper refused to publish an unpaid announcement (with photograph) of the complainant's same sex civil union with those of marriages similarly submitted. The complainant alleged a denial of a public accommodation

under General Statutes § 46a-64 on the basis of sexual orientation and marital status. The respondent claimed First Amendment protection in the exercise of its editorial discretion. Held*:* while there have been legally recognized encroachments on a newspaper's First Amendment rights so as to advance other competing governmental and public interests, such encroachments have not been found in Connecticut (or elsewhere) to extend to the content of unpaid public/personal announcements in a newspaper under the theory that it is a public accommodation. Without a basis for determining that the respondent was a public accommodation for these purposes, the complainant was found to have failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

Kerr, 6/12/08
McDonald, Robert v. Waterbury Republican
0630389
(on appeal, final decision vacated and appeal withdrawn)

Motion to dismiss granted. The respondent newspaper refused to publish an unpaid announcement (with photograph) of the complainant's same sex civil union with those of marriages similarly submitted. The complainant alleged a denial of a public accommodation under General Statutes § 46a-64 on the basis of sexual orientation and marital status. The respondent claimed First Amendment protection in the exercise of its editorial discretion. Held*:* while there have been legally recognized encroachments on a newspaper's First Amendment rights so as to advance other competing governmental and public interests, such encroachments have not been found in Connecticut (or elsewhere) to extend to the content of unpaid public/personal announcements in a newspaper under the theory that it is a public accommodation. Without a basis for determining that the respondent was a public accommodation for these purposes, the complainant was found to have failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

Kerr, 12/09/08
Doe, Jane v. Claywell Electric
0510199

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in employment termination case predicated upon sexual discrimination/harassment and constructive discharge. The complainant was awarded back pay ($3,120), emotional distress ($15,000) and prejudgment interest ($1,310).

Kerr, 1/29/09
Swindell, Jennifer v. Lighthouse Inn
0840137

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to answer in an employment case claiming retaliation and termination on the basis of race (African-American) and having opposed discrimination. The complainant was awarded back pay ($8,000), emotional distress ($1,000) and prejudgment and postjugment interest.

Kerr, 4/21/10
Kinder, Anthony v. Dept. of Children and Families
0730367

Final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in being denied a promotion to the position of social work supervisor because of his race (African-American) and color (black), in violation of General Statutes § 46a-58 (a), 46a-60 (a) (1) and Title Vll. Because of the manifold safety valves built in to the interview and selection process by the respondent to safeguard against discriminatory animus interjecting itself into the selection process, the racial and ethnic composition of the interview panels and the diversity and qualifications of the successful candidates, the complainant was unable to establish a prima-facie case.

Knishkowy, 6/11/99
O'Neill, Eileen v. J.P. Dempsey's, Inc.
9430534

Ruling on discovery motions. Held*:* (1) There is no authority for interrogatories at the CHRO; (2) human rights referees may grant or deny motions to compel on specific discovery issues.

Knishkowy, 7/23/99
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* (1) corporate officer/shareholder/director who performs traditional employee duties on a full-time basis is counted as an "employee" to meet the three-employee requirement of General Statutes §46a-51(10) and (2) corporate officers cannot claim to be de facto partners in order to avoid their responsibilities under the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Knishkowy, 9/1/99
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark
9810387

Motion to dismiss as to one of 3 respondents denied. Motion did not include affidavits or other supporting documents other than excerpts from investigator's reasonable cause finding. Held*:* (1) Although commission investigator had found no reasonable cause as to him, the entire complaint was certified for public hearing; therefore the Referee cannot rely upon the investigator's findings as a basis for dismissing the case. Once a complaint is certified for public hearing, the Referee must conduct *de novo* proceeding on the merits; and (2) if evidence exists to exonerate him, it must be presented at the public hearing.

Knishkowy, 10/13/99
Grant, Sharyn L. v. Yale-New Haven Hospital
9530477

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant failed to prove that her discharge was the result of unlawful discrimination based on race, color, or disability. The respondent articulated—and convincingly proved—a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the discharge; i.e., the complainant could not perform her essential job duties even with reasonable accommodation, and there were no other positions to which she could reasonably be assigned. Furthermore, the respondent satisfied its duty to reasonably accommodate the complainant.

Knishkowy, 11/18/99
Vendryes, Kathrine v. Roadway Package Systems, Inc.
9830539

Ruling on Interrogatories. Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery limited by Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Knishkowy, 12/16/99
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)

Ruling on Interrogatories. Held: Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Knishkowy, 12/20/99
Perry, Claude v. Town of Ansonia
9730481

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* Although the commission investigator found reasonable cause on one allegation in the complaint, and no reasonable cause on the other three allegations, the entire complaint was certified for public hearing in accordance with the plain and unambiguous language of § 46a-84. Once a complaint is certified, the Referee must conduct a de novo hearing on the entire complaint and not rely upon the investigator's report as a basis for dismissal.

Knishkowy, 1/4/00
McNeal-Morris, Malisa v. Czeslaw Gnat
9950108

Hearing in damages. After the complainant negotiated purchase of residential property from the respondent landowner, the respondent changed his mind several times, resulting in a series of postponements for the closing. More than two months after the original closing date, the respondent decided he would not sell to complainant at all. The respondent's liability established by order of default. After hearing in damages, complainant awarded: (1) economic damages for various expenses needlessly incurred in preparation for the closing and move ($3,995), and (2) emotional distress damages ($6,500).

Knishkowy, 4/12/00
Green, Devon v. SNET Co.
9420217

Ruling on Interrogatories. Held*:* interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production.

Knishkowy, 5/4/00
Smith, Eunice v. Dept. of Correction
9710718

Parties' third joint motion to extend deadline for legal briefs (on discovery issue) denied after two previous continuances had been granted. Even though parties are engaged in settlement negotiations, they remain obligated to meet previously-established deadlines set by human rights referee. For the same reason, deadline for exchange of witness lists and exhibit lists extended for only 4 business days. Extension of prehearing conference and hearing dates denied.

Knishkowy, 6/9/00
Secondo, Frank v. Hartford Housing Authority
9710713

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) Entire complaint, as certified, properly before human rights referee, even though commission investigator found no reasonable cause on several of the allegations. (2) Because the respondent chose not to re-fill vacant foreman position in 1997, the complainant did not prove that the respondent's failure to promote him to foreman was motivated by his physical disabilities. Even if the respondent had filled the position, the complainant was not qualified. (3) The respondent did not harass the complainant because of his disabilities. (4) The respondent did not deny overtime opportunities to the complainant because of his disabilities. (5) The respondent did not unlawfully withhold reasonable accommodations from the complainant. For some time, the complainant was able to perform the essential functions of his job without need for reasonable accommodations. After a work-related injury, there were no reasonable accommodations that would allow the complainant to perform the essential functions. (6) The respondent did not retaliate against the complainant for challenging promotional decisions made in 1995 and 1997.

Knishkowy, 6/30/00
Malizia, Angela v. Thames Talent, Ltd.
9820039
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant proved that her supervisor, the respondent's president, sexually harassed her and created a hostile work environment, with strict liability imputed to the respondent. The complainant was terminated from her job shortly after she complained to her supervisor about the harassment. She proved that her termination was in retaliation for opposing his behavior and demonstrated that the respondent's proffered reason—poor attitude and work performance—was a pretext and was the direct result of the supervisor's conduct. The complainant awarded backpay, prejudgment interest, costs of insurance coverage.

Knishkowy, 8/2/00
Little, Ronald v. Stephen Clark
9810387

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant, who suffered from Parkinson's disease, brought action under state and federal fair housing statutes alleging that the respondents, teenage boys in the neighborhood, discriminated against him because of his disabilities. Held*:* the complainant proved that the respondents harassed him because of his disability and created a hostile housing environment. The respondents were found liable for property damage, costs, attorneys fees, and emotional distress.

Knishkowy, 9/8/00
Benjamin, Uel v. Mediplex of Greater Hartford
9910193

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* under certain circumstances, as in this case, a prior arbitration award adverse to the complainant does not bar the complainant from bringing a subsequent action with the commission and has no preclusive effect on the facts and issues raised therein.

Knishkowy, 10/3/00
Chilly, John v. Milford Automatics, Inc.
9830459

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant was terminated from employment when he showed up for work with Bell's palsy. The respondent claimed it terminated the complainant for poor work quality and had been planning to do so for some time. Although the complainant failed to prove that he was disabled under the ADA or CFEPA, he did prove that the respondent regarded him as disabled under CFEPA. The complainant established a strong prima facie case and proved that, under the circumstances of the case, the respondent's proffered reason was unworthy of credence.

Knishkowy, 1/22/01
Leftridge, Rachael v. Anthem Blue Cross & Blue Shield
9830218

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. African-American complainant alleged that the respondent failed to promote her because of her race. The complainant had worked for the respondent for nine years, yet the promotion was given to a white co-worker who had only worked for one year. Although the complainant was qualified for the promotion and met her prima facie case, the respondent justified its decision by demonstrating that the promoted employee was better qualified. The complainant failed to show that the respondent's reason lacked credence or that it masked an unlawful discriminatory motive.

Knishkowy, 3/1/01
Williams, Robert v. M.N.S. Corporation
0010124

Hearing In damages. The respondent's liability determined by entry of order of default. Award of back pay made to black employee who was terminated from truck-driving position and subsequently replaced by white driver.

Knishkowy, 8/9/01
Saksena, Sharad v. Dept. of Revenue Services
9940089
(appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant suffered from depression and sought, as accommodation, the ability to work at home. When his request was denied, he resigned. In this instance, working at home was not a reasonable accommodation. Furthermore, the respondent did provide other reasonable accommodations to complainant. The complainant also failed to prove constructive discharge because he was unable to prove that the respondent denied him a reasonable accommodation and because he was unable to show that the respondent intentionally created a work environment so intolerable that would force a reasonable person to resign voluntarily.

Knishkowy, 2/14/02
Gill, Rosemarie v. Hartford Public Schools
0010417

Ruling on interrogatories. Held*:* Interrogatories not allowed in administrative proceedings. Discovery is limited by the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of practice to requests for production/disclosure of documents.

Knishkowy, 2/15/02
Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors
0030569, 0030586, 0030587

Motion to disqualify opposing counsel denied. Held: The law firm of a lawyer who represented the complainant many years ago now represents the respondents in the present action. The complainant moved to disqualify the firm and its members under Rule 1.9 and 1.10 of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Because the earlier representation bears no "substantial relationship"—in fact, no relationship at all—to the present matter, no violation of the Rules exists.

Knishkowy, 3/15/02
Kowalczyk, Lynne v. City of New Britain
9810482
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Three public school employees were transferred to other schools because their strained and volatile interpersonal relationships demonstrated a potential for disruption in the school where all three worked. The complainant brought this action against the city, the board of education, and two administrators, alleging that the transfer was based on her mental disability and her sexual orientation. Held: (1) complainant failed to meet her prima facie case for each claim, because her transfer was not an "adverse employment action;" (2) complainant failed to demonstrate, for purposes of her prima facie burden, that she was transferred "because of" her disability; (3) complainant failed to demonstrate, for purposes of her prima facie burden, any circumstances giving rise to an inference of discrimination based on her sexual orientation; (4) individual respondents not liable, as matter of law, under ADA, General Statutes §46a-60(a)(1), or §46a-81c; (5) complainant failed to prove facts showing individual respondents aided or abetted discriminatory practice in violation of §46a-60(a)(5).

Knishkowy, 3/21/02
Ceslik, Stephen v. Napoli Motors
0030569, 0030586, 0030587

Motion to strike special defenses granted. The respondent raised two special defenses predicated upon prior findings and determination of the commission investigator as to some of the allegations in the complaint. However, the complaint was certified to hearing in its entirety, and thus, the referee must conduct a de novo hearing on the entire complaint; the respondent cannot successfully base special defenses solely on the investigator's report.

Knishkowy, 12/5/02
Stevens, Lorraine v. Urban League
0010328

Motion to dismiss denied. Motion to dismiss may be treated as a motion to strike, where the respondents challenge not jurisdiction, but the legal sufficiency of claim. The respondents moved to dismiss portion of complaint predicated upon §46a-58(a), asserting that it cannot co-exist with §46a-60(a) employment discrimination claim, pursuant to *CHRO v. Truelove & Maclean, Inc.*, 238 Conn. 337(1996). Notwithstanding the respondents' interpretation of *Truelove*, §46a-58(a) "has expressly converted a violation of federal antidiscrimination laws [here, Title VII] into a violation of Connecticut antidiscrimination laws." (*Trimachi v. Connecticut Workers Comp. Comm*., 2000 WL 872451 (Conn. Super.)) Motion to dismiss §46a-58(a) claim, when treated as a motion to strike, is denied.

Knishkowy, 1/17/03
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co.
0120389

Motion to dismiss/motion for summary judgment denied. Motion to dismiss may be viewed as motion for summary judgment when the issue is one of facts, not of jurisdiction. In motion for summary judgment, the tribunal's role is not to resolve issues of fact, but to determine if any issue of material fact exists. The movant bears the burden of demonstrating there is no genuine issue of material fact. Based on conflicting affidavits from two physicians, whether complainant's sinusitis and rhinitis were chronic impairments under state law is a question of fact to be decided by the referee. Additionally, the respondent's allegation that it had no notice of complainant's need for accommodation was amply contradicted by the complainant's affidavit; thus, this is also a factual matter requiring full adjudication.

Knishkowy, 2/6/04
Nobili, Thomas v. David E. Purdy & Co.
0120389

Final decision. Judgment for the respondents. Held: the complainant, a certified public accountant, failed to prove 4th prong of prima facie case in his state law complaint alleging termination because of his disability, sinusitis. Even if he had proven his prima facie case, he could not meet his ultimate burden of proving that his termination was motivated by a discriminatory animus. The complainant also failed to satisfy the prima facie case for his "failure to accommodate" state law claim because he did not need an accommodation in order to perform the essential functions of his job. The complainant finally failed to prove that his termination and other adverse employment actions constituted unlawful retaliation in violation of state antidiscrimination law.

Knishkowy, 7/21/04
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education.
0420409

Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part. Held: (1) The complainant's first allegation was based on a discrete event occurring more than 180 days prior to the filing of the complaint. Although in certain circumstances the 180-day filing requirement may be excused for equitable reasons, the commission, in its response to the motion, provided no suggestion--much less any evidence--of any such reason. The motion to dismiss this portion of the complaint is granted. (2) The respondent challenged the second allegation by claiming that failure to transfer or promote the complainant to a certain position did not constitute an adverse employment action. Such determination is a matter of fact and thus requires full adjudication. The motion to dismiss this portion of the complaint is denied.

Knishkowy, 09/21/04
Cordone, Angelo v. Bridgeport Board of Education
0420409

Motion for leave to amend complaint denied In an age discrimination case, the complainant moved to amend his complaint by adding legal conclusions of disability discrimination. Although the complainant argues that the additional charges clarify the factual allegations in the original complaint and "conform the legal grounds for the complaint with the factual allegations," such bald assertions are simply incorrect. Nothing in the original complaint so much as even alludes to any disability. (Note: The respondent's failure to respond to the complainant's motion does not mandate automatic approval of the motion; rather, the presiding officer must still determine if the proposed amendment is "reasonable." See Regs. Conn. State Agencies, § 46a-54-80a(e).)

Knishkowy, 11/28/05
Carretero, Stefan v. Hartford Public Schools.
0310481

Two-part Motion for "Summary Disposition" denied. The complainant filed his initial complaint alleging that the non-renewal of his teaching contract was motivated by discrimination; in his amended complaint, he claimed that the respondent's refusal to replace the termination notice in his personnel file with a resignation letter was in retaliation for his initial complaint. Held*:* (1) the respondent's claim that complainant failed to exhaust administrative remedies raises a jurisdictional issue and thus is treated as motion to dismiss. The exhaustion doctrine applies when a party brings a complaint to the superior court without exhausting administrative remedies. In this case, the doctrine is not applicable; there is no legal justification, explicit or otherwise, or convincing policy argument for a complainant to exhaust remedies under Teacher Tenure Act (§10-151) before bringing a discriminatory termination claim to the CHRO. (2) The respondent also argues that the complainant has not demonstrated that he suffered an adverse employment action, and that allowing the complainant to substitute a resignation letter at this time would compromise the respondent's

ability to defend against the initial claim. Whether the complainant suffered an adverse employment action is an issue of material fact whose resolution is premature without further evidence. While the legal defense argument has been recognized as valid by various court decisions, in this case further evidence is needed before this tribunal can rule conclusively, especially in light of allegation that the respondent stated that its refusal to change the personnel file was due to the filing of the initial complaint.

Knishkowy, 3/16/06
Magda, Muriel v. Diageo North America
0420213

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent moved to dismiss two lesser allegations which the investigator had found to be untimely filed. The motion was unaccompanied by the investigator's report or any other pertinent documentation. The motion was denied because (1) the investigator certified the entire complaint—and not merely portions thereof--to public hearing, so the timeliness challenges will need to be addressed de novo at hearing; (2) the challenged allegations may be a part of a "continuing violation" and the complainant should have the opportunity to adduce evidence on this matter.

Knishkowy, 5/23/06
Saddler, Tina v Margaret Landry dba
0450057

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant proved that the respondent, a real estate broker, denied her an apartment because of her lawful source of income (Section 8 assistance), in violation of § 46a-64c.

Knishkowy, 6/30/06
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc.
0420316

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent liable for sex discrimination when it terminated the complainant because of her pregnancy. The complainant recovered back pay, interest, and certain travel expenses associated with new job. However, back pay and travel expenses recoverable only until the time the respondent went out of business (a year prior to judgment), as complainant would have been lawfully dismissed at that time. Front pay disallowed for the same reason. Emotional distress damages awarded under §46a-86(c), based on the premise that a violation of Title VII constituted a violation of §46a-58(a) [following the CT Supreme Court's decision in *CHRO v. Board of Education of Town of Cheshire*, 270 Conn. 665 (2004)].

Knishkowy, 10/5/06
Taranto, Jennifer v. Big Enough, Inc.
0420316

Modified final decision on reconsideration. In initial final decision (6/30/06), the respondent's liability established by order of default, but back pay damages awarded only up until the time the respondent ceased business (one year before issuance of this decision). On reconsideration, the back pay award was increased by one week, in light of document showing the correct date of the respondent's dissolution.

Knishkowy, 10/26/06
Hartling, Judy v. Jeffrey Carfi
0550116

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondents liable for retaliation (in response to prior CHRO complaint) and for housing discrimination and harassment based on the complainant's sexual orientation. Pursuant to §46a-86(c) the referee awarded the complainant $1315 for various costs and $25,000 for emotional distress damages.

Knishkowy, 03/15/07
Rhodes, Kevin v. Mortgage Company of America
0630040

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent liable for race discrimination for its treatment (i.e., "terms and conditions of employment") and ultimate termination of the complainant. Pursuant to §46a-86(b) the referee awarded the complainant $33,960 for back pay and unpaid commissions, along with compounded pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

Knishkowy, 3/22/07
Mejias, David v. Mortgage Company of America
0630076

Hearing in damages. By virtue of default, the respondent deemed liable for national origin discrimination for its treatment (i.e., "terms and conditions of employment") and ultimate constructive discharge of the complainant. Pursuant to §46a-86(b), the referee awarded the complainant $43,214 for back pay and unpaid commissions, along with compounded pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

Knishkowy, 07/03/07
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson
0750001, 0750002

Ruling on request for production. Held: Notwithstanding the caption of this document, the respondent's pleading is, de facto, a set of interrogatories. Discovery is limited by the Uniform

Administrative Procedure Act and the commission's regulations to requests for production. Absent express authorization, interrogatories are impermissible.

Knishkowy, 08/27/07
Feroleto, Salvatore v. CT Dept. of Mental Retardation
0510140

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent employer moved to dismiss complaint (or portions thereof) as untimely because some of the alleged discriminatory acts occurred beyond the statutory filing period. The filing requirement is not jurisdictional, but is like a statute of limitations, with which one must comply absent factors such as waiver, consent or equitable tolling. (1) Although untimely discrete acts may be barred even if they are related to timely acts, the vaguely-asserted allegations in the complaint lack details and pertinent dates; only after further evidence can this tribunal determine which acts fall within, and which beyond, the filing period. (2) Because the complainant alleges ongoing harassment (due to his disability), he is entitled to adduce evidence at trial to demonstrate a hostile work environment, which would toll the filing requirement. (3) The complainant should also be allowed to adduce evidence to show that the other actions alleged in his complaint (e.g., ongoing unequal pay, ongoing denial of reasonable accommodations) constitute a "policy or practice" of discrimination, which might also toll the filing requirement.

Knishkowy, 11/19/07
Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies
0510366

Final decision. Judgment for complainant on CFEPA age discrimination claim; federal ADEA claim raised via General Statutes 46a-58(a) denied because referee has no authority to adjudicate federal age discrimination cases via 46a-58(a). The complainant was terminated during the respondent's reduction in work force (RIF). When the complainant asked his supervisor if he (complainant) was selected for layoff because of his age, the supervisor stated, "Yes. We keep the younger people." Because of the direct nature of the credible evidence—the statement by the de facto decision maker at the time of and in the context of the termination—the case was analyzed under the Price-Waterhouse mixed motive paradigm. The complainant's satisfaction of his evidentiary burden, shifted the burden to the respondent to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it nonetheless terminated the complainant for other valid reasons. The supervisor's credibility was damaged by his demeanor and attitude on the stand, his faulty memory, and inconsistencies with other testimony—both his own and that of others. The supervisor also did not follow the protocol established for the RIF process, further weakening his justification for the choices of who would be terminated and who would remain. The complainant awarded back pay plus interest.

Knishkowy, 12/27/07
Szydlo, Adam v. EDAC Technologies
0510366

Ruling on reconsideration. Back pay award increased (a) to correct a typographical error in final decision, and (b) to include complainant's out-of-pocket costs of obtaining health insurance for period of seven months. Inclusion of annual merit increases (had complainant not been terminated) in calculations was rejected as too speculative, since merit increases were subjective-based and in the past were not given every year.

Knishkowy, 3/26/08
Robinson, Patricia v. Dept. of Mental Health
0630292

Motion to dismiss is denied with one exception. (1) the respondent argued this employment discrimination claim was barred by doctrine of sovereign immunity. The respondent relied upon *Lyon v. Jones*, 104 Conn. App. 547 (2007), cert. granted, 285 Conn. 914 (2008) in support of assertion that this tribunal lacks jurisdiction because the complainant did not obtain permission to sue from the state claims commissioner. The respondent erred because General Statutes § 4-142 exempts from the claims commissioner's purview "claims for which an administrative hearing procedure otherwise is established by law." The CHRO administrative process for discrimination claims is precisely the type envisioned here. (2) The respondent also incorrectly claimed that this tribunal has no jurisdiction over federal claims. Case law has clarified that General Statutes § 46a-58 (a) expressly converts a violation of federal antidiscrimination law into a violation of Connecticut antidiscrimination laws. § 46a-58 (a) does not include "age" as one of the listed protected classes, so the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act cannot be raised via 46a-58 (a) and must be dismissed. The complainant's federal race, color, physical disability, and retaliation claims remain viable through 46a-58 (a).

Knishkowy, 11/17/08
Brown, Johnmark & Clarissa v. Arlette Jackson
0750001, 0750002

Final decision. Judgment for complainants. Complainants husband and wife rented apartment from the respondent landlord. When husband lost his job after several months, he applied for rental subsidy. The respondent landlord refused to complete the requisite forms and husband ultimately could not complete his application to obtain the subsidy. The respondent offered myriad reasons for her refusal, many inherently inconsistent or simply not credible. Held: given liberal reading of fair housing statutes, and following logic of other cases, thwarting the complainant's ability to obtain subsidy is not meaningfully different than outright refusing to accept lawful subsidy. The landlord violated §46a-64c(a)(2). After refusing to help husband, the landlord engaged in a two-month period of severe harassment of both complainants. Held: landlord's egregious, severe and pervasive actions and provocations

were in retaliation for husband's attempt to obtain subsidy, and they created a hostile housing environment, violating both §§ 46a-64c(a)(2) and 46a-64c(a)(9).

Knishkowy, 1/15/09
Langan, Kevin v. RCK Corp. dba JP Dempsey's
0730256

Motion to compel granted. The complainant was terminated from his position as "bar manager" in the respondent restaurant, allegedly because of his disabilities (real and/or perceived). The commission filed request for production that included requests for information about other employees--information likely found in personnel files. The respondent objected to certain requests for disclosure as overly burdensome, not "germane" to the complaint, and protected by the privacy rights of other employees. Ruling: (1) a claim of "unduly burdensome" requires some explanation of the nature of the burden; mere recitation of the phrase is insufficient; (2) because the complainant/commission are comparing the respondent's treatment of the complainant with that of other employees, certain information about other employees may be relevant or, when disclosed, may lead to the discovery of relevant information; (3) Although General Statutes § 31-128f protects the confidentiality and integrity of personnel files, there are several narrow exceptions, one of which allows disclosure "pursuant to a lawfully issued administrative summons or judicial order . . . or in response to . . . the investigation or defense of personnel-related complaints against the employer."

Levine, 6/5/2009
Barnes, Arnell v. Alan S. Goodman, Inc.
0710395

Motion for summary judgment: denied. Held: (1) referees have the authority to rule on motions for summary judgment; and (2) issue of material issue of fact exists as evident by the complaint affidavit alleging discrimination based on color (black) and disparate treatment, production compliance resulting in some documentation of disparate treatment and the respondent's vigorous denial of discrimination.

Levine, 10/20/2009
Moore, John v. CT Dept. of Children & Families
07310209

Motion to dismiss denied. Held: (1) General Statute 46a-58 (a) converts a violation of federal anti-discrimination laws into a violation of Connecticut anti-discrimination laws. The timing requirement for filing a complaint is that under state law. (2) It is premature to grant a motion to dismiss, given the generalized claims of sexual discrimination. (3) The issue is whether the complainant is entitled to offer evidence in support of his claim. (4) At this stage in the administrative proceedings, it is not possible to accurately assess the validity of the respondent's claims that there is no jurisdiction over the original complaint or the amendments. (5) The complainant's claims allege employment discrimination, not workplace violence, and there is no pre-emption of jurisdiction.

Manzione, 3/3/99
Isler, Jacqueline v. Yale-New Haven Hospital
9730024

Ruling on discovery motions. Held*:* (1) There is no authority for interrogatories at the CHRO; (2) human rights referees may grant or deny motions to compel on specific discovery issues.

Manzione, 6/16/99
Sloss, George T. v. Ed-Mor Electric Company
9930221

Hearing in damages. At a hearing in damages, where no one for the respondent appeared, the complainant was awarded $7,568.00 in back pay, $2,022.00 to reimburse the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation, $2,854.08 to reimburse the complainant's union for other benefits and $46.22/mo. For prejudgment interest for his claim of discrimination based on age.

Manzione, 6/17/99
Allen, Sheila v. Pollack's
9710692

Motion to dismiss granted. At a public hearing, the human rights referee granted a motion to dismiss from the respondent's counsel (with the support of the commission) based on complainant's failure to cooperate. (The complainant was pro se and failed to respond to numerous communications from the commission counsel and the Office of Public Hearings).

Manzione, 6/22/99
Onoh, Mystraine v. Sterling, Inc.
9620499

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* (1) construing the facts in a light most favorable to the non-moving party, facts are in dispute, therefore, case is not ripe for a motion to dismiss; and (2) human rights referees have the authority to dismiss a complaint even absent a full evidentiary hearing on the merits.

Manzione, 7/22/99
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores
9510617

Motion to dismiss postponed for evidentiary hearing. Held*:* there are questions of fact as to whether the complaint against additional named respondents should be dismissed (i.e. whether "successor liability" should attach and whether to "pierce the corporate veil"). Accordingly, a conference call shall be scheduled to discuss limited discovery on this issue and set a date for an evidentiary hearing on this jurisdictional question.

Manzione, 9/1/99
Henry, Robert v. Edwards Super Food Stores
9510617

Respondents' motion to dismiss and the commission's motion for stay. Held*:* (1) a parent corporation may be dismissed from an action when allegations are brought against its subsidiary for discriminatory treatment based on disability where the corporate veil of the parent is not able to be pierced under either the "instrumentality" or "identity" rule; (2) successor liability does not attach to a company that purchased all of the assets of a predecessor company through a Purchase Agreement that specifically did not assume any liabilities and therefore said "successor" company is dismissed; and (3) a motion for stay is not granted based on the outcome of a pending declaratory ruling before the commission because the ruling has no more weight than a decision in a contested case proceeding and the timeliness of the outcome is uncertain.

Manzione, 10/6/99
Hodge, Pamela v. Dept. of Public Health
9710032
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* the respondent is ordered to promote the complainant and pay her backpay with simple interest. Although the complainant did not formally apply for the position when it was posted, she made enough efforts to find out about the position while she was out on a maternity/medical leave to meet the application requirement under *McDonnell Douglas*. She should have been considered for the position and had she been considered, she would have been hired based on her education, training, experience and status as an affirmative action goal candidate.

Manzione, 3/6/00
Massa, Berzeda v. Electric Boat Corporation
9840265

Motion in limine. Held*:* once a complaint is certified to public hearing, it is viewed as a whole. Therefore, all allegations within it are the subject of the public hearing regardless of whether reasonable cause was found or conciliation attempted and failed with respect to each allegation within the complaint. (Note: A copy of the ruling is available by contacting the Office of Public Hearings.)

Manzione, 5/3/00
Alston, Dawn on behalf of Terrel Alston v. East Haven Bd. of Ed.
9830205
(on appeal stipulated judgment)

Motion to dismiss granted. Held*:* (1) public schools are not public accommodations under General Statutes § 46a-64(a); (2) the commission does not have jurisdiction over allegations

of discrimination brought pursuant to General Statutes § 10-15c; and (2) General Statutes §§ 46a-75 and 46a-81m do not cover public schools.

Manzione, 5/12/00
Ratner, Ira v. Home & Life Security, Inc.
9930246

Motion to dismiss granted due to failure to cooperate. The complainant, who was represented by counsel, failed to comply with multiple orders. The complainant, himself, failed to attend a settlement conference without excuse or permission. The complainant also failed to file and serve a settlement conference report, failed to produce documents in compliance with a ruling on a motion to compel, filed to file and serve exhibit and witness lists, failed to bring exhibits to the prehearing conference and failed to return opposing counsel's telephone calls. Held*:* the human rights referee has authority to dismiss complaints pursuant to § 46a-54-101 of the Regulations. Also, the nature of the relationship between the attorney and his client is one of traditional agency. The acts of an attorney are ordinarily attributed to his client. Therefore, the severe inaction of the complainant or his attorney warrants dismissal of the complaint

Manzione, 6/5/00
Amos, Barry E. v. Town of West Hartford
9910041, 9910198, 9910199, 9910200, 9910201, 9910202

Motion for stay denied. Held*:* a matter scheduled for public hearing in six weeks will not be stayed pending the outcome of a possible declaratory judgment by a judicial authority because (1) the commission is charged with addressing complaints of discrimination; (2) the commission declined to address this matter through a declaratory ruling and rather set the matter down for these "specified proceedings;" (3) the matter is ripe for adjudication because most of the pre-hearing matters have already occurred; and (4) proceeding with the public hearing, rather than staying it, will resolve the "real and substantial dispute between the parties."

Manzione, 10/4/00
Alexsavich, Bruce & Ronald Ferguson v. Pratt & Whitney Aircraft
9330373, 9330374

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* the complainants proved a prima facie case because they were members of a protected class under the ADEA (over age 40), qualified for the position, demoted under circumstances giving rise to an inference of age discrimination. They failed, however, to meet their ultimate burden of proving age discrimination because they did not prove that the respondent's legitimate, non-discriminatory reason of selection for the reduction in force (RIF) based on performance was pretextual.

Manzione, 4/19/01
Mather, Jayantha v. Dept. of Transportation
9810116
(rev'd on appeal)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The complainant proved a prima facie case that his failure to be promoted was discriminatorily based on his race and national origin (Sri Lankan). The respondent articulated two legitimate business reasons: not possessing the required Professional Engineers license and not being the candidate chosen by the interview panel. The complainant proved that these reasons were pretextual by showing that similarly situated white employees were treated differently. The complainant failed, however, to meet his burden of proving that the respondent did not promote him in retaliation for filing a prior CHRO complaint or serving as Chair of the internal affirmative action advisory committee. The respondent must pay $9,268.12 as compensation for back pay plus 10% compounded interest; promote the complainant to the next open appropriate position; pay the complainant as front pay an adjustment between his current salary and what he would have been earning had he been promoted, until he is promoted or retires, whichever comes first; credit the complainant with any vacation, personal or other days used for the hearing; and not engage in any retaliatory conduct as a result of these proceedings.

Mount, 04/11/2012
Bentley-Meunier, LaToya v DEKK Group dba Dunkin Donuts
1140322

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $17,619.90 in backpay; $7,500 in emotional distress damages and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 08/02/2012
Warner, Stephen v NERAC, Inc.
0840031

Motion to dismiss. The respondent's motion to dismiss contends that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear an age discrimination claim because of the minimum age requirement under the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act, that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear a claim for familial status under Section 46a-60(a)(1) and that ERISA pre-empts jurisdiction of the complainant's health insurance claim. *Held*: the commission has subject matter jurisdiction over age and sex discrimination claims, and the complainant is not asserting a claim directly connected to the health insurance plan.

Mount, 12/13/2012
Warner, Steven v NERAC and Kevin Bouley
0840031

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated from his employment because of his age and his wife's pregnancy. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating her employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Mount, 01/10/2013
Vargas, Alsenet v Dept of Correction
1110437

Motion to dismiss granted. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated Genral Statutes sections 46a-58(a)m 46a-64(a) and 46a-71 when it denied her the right to nurse her child in the correctional facility's visiting room while visiting her incarcerated husband. *Held*: correctional facilities visiting rooms are not places of public accommodation under General Statute Section 46a-63. Further, the respondent did not discriminate in providing services as General Statute Section 46a-71 does not apply because a correctional facility does not serve the general public.

Mount, 02/04/2013
Morales, Lourdes v Trinity College
1110162
Mount, 02/04/2013

Motion to dismiss, 180-day rule; equitable tolling

Ruling on the respondent's motion to dismiss. Motion granted in part and denied in part. Motion granted as to the complainant's claims regarding her suspension as they are time barred. Motion denied as to the remaining claims.

Mount, 08/22/2013
Stephenson, Arline v Webster Bank
1110235

Ruling on motion for summary judgment re ADEA: The complainant brought an age discrimination claim under the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) as enforced through General Statute Section 46a-58(a) and under General Statute Sections 46a-60(a)(1) and (4). *Held*: the ADEA claim is dismissed as age is not an enumerated protected class in Section 46a-58(a).

Mount, 01/29/2014
Collazo, Jorge v 3M Purification and 3M Cuno
0940298

Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that he was subjected to harassment, and unequal tr4eatment due to hi national origin and ancestry. He later amended his complaint to include a claim of that he was terminated in retaliation for his filing of the complaint. *Held*: the complainant proved that the responded discriminated against him. He was awarded backpay of $70,988.35; prejudgment interest of $31,944.75; attorney fees of $24,580; emotional distress damages of $5000 and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 09/15/2014
Mohammed, Saeed v Norwalk Economic Opportunity Now Inc
1420210

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay of $721, pre-judgment interest of $72.30 per week, emotional distress damages of $1,000 and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 10/28/2014
Punzalan, Roxanne v Zheng Trust LLC dba Koto Japanese Restaurant
1140112

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay in the amount of $9,861.50; emotional distress damages of $7,500; attorney fees in the amount of $8,150, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 10/31/2014
Masterson, Maria v Polish American Citizen's Club
1030184

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. Complainant awarded $7,261 and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 11/14/2014
Senra, Susan v Groton Open MRI LLC
1140018

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that she was illegally terminated due to her gender and pregnancy in violation of General Statutes Sections 45a-60a (1) and (7). *Held*: the complainant established that her pregnancy was a motivating factor in her termination. Complainant awarded backpay of $7,945 and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 12/08/2014
Peters, Wendy Ann v Polish American Citizen's Club
1220183

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to appear. The respondent was ordered to pay the complainant $2,752 in backpay and pre- and post judgement interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $1518 in reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Mount, 02/11/2015
Staszewski, Mark v Town of Wallingford
1030290

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in the terms and conditions of his employment and retaliated against and that his mental disability/physical disability and previous opposition to discriminatory conduct were factors in the respondent's actions. *Held*: the complainant failed to establish a prima facie case.

Mount, 03/04/2015
Phan, Khoa v Hartford Police
1210181 (appeal pending)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent illegally discriminated against him when it terminated him from his position as a probationary police office because of his ancestry. The complainant was awarded $210,596 in backpay; $25,000 in emotional distress damages; and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 05/07/2015
Lorimer, Valerie v Southern CT State Univ
1230447

Motion to strike. *Held*: motion denied. The complainant pleaded sufficient facts to sustain her claim. Whether an entity is a place of public accommodation is a fact specific inquiry.

Mount, 09/07/2016
Perreira, Bhagmattie v Yale New Haven Hospital
1430048

Motion for summary judgement. Motion granted. Two years prior to filing this complaint against Yale New Haven Hospital (YNHH), the complainant has filed a complaint against the Hospital of Saint Raphael (HSR). The complaint filed against YNHH, successor in interest to HSR. The complaint again YNHH is nearly identical to the earlier one filed against HSR. Subsequent to filing the complaint against YNHH, the complainant signed a release and settlement agreement in her case against HSR. *Held*: motion granted. The principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel apply. If the complainant were to go forward and be successful in this complaint, she would be recovering for an alleged injury for which she has already been compensated.

Mount, 10/20/2016
Miranda, Andrew v New Haven Bd of Educ
1030148

Final decision. Judgement for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent illegally discriminated against him when it unilaterally withdrew him from school. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent's articulated business reason for withdrawing him from school was not credible and was instead a pretext for discrimination. The complainant was awarded $25,000 in emotional distress damages.

Mount, 04/18/2018
Wynkoop, Dawn, v NERAC, Inc. and Kevin Bouley
0840008

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that her employment was terminated because of her age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating her employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Mount, 08/02/2018
Lohr, Grace v Greenwich Bd of Education
1220147

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for its decision to terminate the complainant's employment.

Mount, 10/03/2019
Leonard, Cynthia v City of Waterbury
1630341 (appeal pending)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent did not interview her for, or promote her to, the position of human resources assistant because of her physical disability. *Held*: the complainant established that the respondent's articulated reason was a pretext for discrimination. She met all the requirements of the first job posting and had been performing the job for which she had applied. The respondent's revision to the original job posting was arbitrarily and discriminatorily motivated. The complainant was awarded $118,353.06 in backpay, $35,000 in emotional distress damages, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Mount, 04/18/2021
Brule, James v NERAC and Kevin Bouley
0840032

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Mount, 04/18/2021
Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley
0840162

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Mount, 04/18/2018
Eitelman, Douglas v NERAC, Inc and Kevin Bouley
0840162

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Mount, 04/18/2018
Sloman, David Bruce v NERAC Inc and Kevin Bouley
0840243

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that his employment was terminated because of his age. *Held*: The complainant signed a valid release waiving his right to bring this claim. Further, the complainant's evidence did not give rise to an inference of discrimination and, even if so, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason for terminating his employment. Because the claim against NERAC failed, the aiding and abetting claim against Mr. Bouley also failed.

Trojanowski, 5/7/99
Cuffee, Tampiepko Tion v. Nine West Group, Inc.
9720038

Motion to dismiss granted. Human rights referee granted a joint motion from the commission and the respondent based on the complainant's failure to respond to written and telephonic conversations for over a year.

Trojanowski, 9/1/99
Doe (1993) Jane v. Ice Cream Delight
9310191

Hearing in damages. Part-time yogurt store worker who was sexually harassed and terminated requested monetary damages consisting of back pay, front pay and compound interest. Held*:* (1) the complainant is entitled to two years back pay which terminated when she obtained a higher paying job; (2) the complainant not entitled to front pay because she was made whole economically by the award of back pay; (3) the awarding of interest and whether it is compounded is in the discretion of the presiding human rights referee. Compound pre-judgment interest awarded on the award of backpay from the date of the discriminatory act; (4) Statutory post-judgment interest; and (5) Various equitable remedies.

Trojanowski, 1/26/00
Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington
9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(On appeal, dismissed in part and remanded to referee in part; see suppl. decision)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held*:* (1) the complainants failed to prove that they were paid less than certain male employees for equal work on jobs whose performance requires equal skill, effort and responsibility and which are performed under similar working conditions; (2) the respondent's Job Study, introduced by the complainants to prove their case, was disallowed because it only measured two of the statutory criteria required by the Equal Pay Act and did not measure effort or performance under similar working conditions; (3) the complainants failed to prove discriminatory intent by the respondent in paying them less than comparable male employees; and (4) the respondent's jurisdictional argument that the commission was precluded from considering the complainants' complaints because there have been prior arbitrator's decisions on the same or similar issues as those before the human rights referee, was denied because there was no written or verbal waiver of statutory rights to a hearing before the commission by the complainants or their collective bargaining agent.

Trojanowski, 1/28/00
Gomez, Isabel v. United Security, Inc.
9930490
(appeal dismissed)

Hearing in damages. Female security guard awarded: (1) back pay; (2) pre-judgment interest; and (3) statutory post-judgment interest.

Trojanowski, 6/7/00
Shulman, Thomas E. v. Professional Help Desk
9720041
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* (1) The complainant is an "individual with a disability" due to his physical impairment of being a wheelchair-bound paraplegic which was found to substantially limit the major life activities of walking and running; (2) The complainant was qualified to perform the essential functions of the job because of his educational background and prior work experience; (3) The complainant requested four reasonable accommodations in order to assist him in performing the essential functions of his job which the respondent never provided; (4) The respondent never introduced any evidence of undue hardship; (5) The complainant's impairment of being a wheelchair-bound paraplegic met both of the definitions of "physically disabled" as well as "reliance on a wheelchair" under state law; and (6) The complainant proved that he was retaliated against through his discharge for exercising his right to request reasonable accommodations under the ADA.

Trojanowski, 8/14/00
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept.
9710685, 9710637
(remanded decision on appeal; appeal withdrawn)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainants did not establish a prima facie case proving that the failure of the respondent to promote them was based on intentional discrimination due to their race and gender. The complainants also failed to establish a prima facie case proving that the respondent retaliated against them for the exercise of their rights under Title VII and CFEPA. After appeal, decision was remanded. On remand, December 5, 2001, judgment for commission and complainant Donahue with relief as set forth in the decision. On December 10, 2001 a corrected final decision on remand issued to correct the calculation and award of damages.

Trojanowski, 9/7/00
Cooper, John & John C. Donahue v. City of Hartford Fire Dept.
9710685, 9710637

Petition for reconsideration denied. The commission filed a petition for reconsideration citing the existence of a "valid settlement agreement" as its good cause. The respondent filed an objection based on the fact that although there was a proposed agreement between counsel, the agreement had not been approved by the Hartford City Council, the only authority authorized by the City Charter to approve settlements proposed by the Corporation Counsel. When the final decision was rendered, the City Council had not acted to finalize the agreement. Thus, the proposed settlement was invalidated because the decision came out before the Council had acted.

Trojanowski 4/11/01
Agvent, Rosa Maria v. Ace Tech, Inc. a.k.a. Applied Computer Engineering Technology
0020042

Hearing in damages. Female computer worker awarded backpay, compound prejudgment interest, statutory postjudgment interest, and other equitable relief.

Trojanowski, 7/13/01
Gyurko, Nancy v. City of Torrington
9730281, 9730280, 9730279, 9730278
(Supplemental decision)
(appeal dismissed)

The appeal was dismissed as to the presiding referee's dismissal of the complainants' EPA claim and remanded for further analysis of their Title VII and CFEPA claims. On remand, Held*:* Complaint dismissed. The complainant's failed to show the males to whom they compared themselves held similar or comparable jobs and failed to show discriminatory animus by the respondents.

Trojanowski, 8/28/01
Weller-Bajrami, Catherine v. Lawrence Crest Cooperative, Inc.
99500095, 9950096

Hearing in damages. Claim by a tenant of the respondent and her children that they were discriminated against because of her race, white, her sex, female, and her physical disability, chronic ulcerative colitis. The complainant's children were not awarded any damages. The complainant was awarded the following types of damages: security deposits, moving costs, rent differentials, the cost of alternative housing, utility (electric bill) differentials, $20,000 for her emotional distress and $6,562 for attorney's fees.

Trojanowski, 9/12/03
Downes, Elizabeth v. zUniversity.com
0210366

Hearing in damages. The complainant was terminated because of her sex, familial status and her pregnancy. Damages included back pay performance bonus, and money for medical coverage.

Trojanowski, 9/30/03
Gillmore, Alexis v. Mothers Works, Inc.
0330195

Hearing in damages. The complainant was terminated because of her gender, familial status and her pregnancy. Damages included back pay.

Trojanowski, 1/23/04
Smalls, Kelly v. Waterbury Masonry & Foundation, Inc.
0330386

Hearing in damages. Discrimination due to a physical disability, a “drop foot” condition, in violation of General Statutes § 46a-60(a)(1) as well as the American with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq. Awarded back pay and lost benefits, prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest.

Trojanowski, 05/05/04
Caggiano, Caterina v. Doreen Rockhead
0450017

Hearing in damages. Housing case. The complainant was awarded $210 in compensatory damages for medical care, $150 for attorney’s fees, $4,500 for emotional distress damages and post judgment interest of 10% per annum.

Trojanowski, 10/18/04
Kelly, Brian v. City of New Britain
0210359

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondent argued that (1) the complainant not physically disabled as defined under the ADA, Rehabilitation Act, or § 46a-60(a)(1) and (2) the complaint was barred by the statute of limitations because it was filed more than 180 days after the filing of the complaint. The respondent’s first argument is more properly a motion for summary judgment and was treated as such. The motion denied in its entirety.

Trojanowski, 11/17/04
Daniels, Elbert v. U. S. Security Associates, Inc.
0430286

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged he had been discriminated against on the basis of his race. The complainant was awarded back pay and prejudgment interest. The respondent also ordered to reimburse the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Trojanowski, 05/10/07
DeBarros, Paula v Hartford Roofing, Co., Inc.
0430162

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged sexual harassment because of her sex and constructive discharge because of the harassment. The complainant awarded back pay of $15,223.30; health insurance benefits of $8,254.82, and pre- and post-judgment interest.

Trojanowski, 07/19/06
Melvin, Roderick v. Yale University
0230320

Amended final decision. Complaint dismissed. The complainant alleged that he was discriminated against in the terms and conditions of his employment; given warnings, poor evaluations and unfairly disciplined; received unequal pay; retaliated against; not promoted; and terminated because of his having filed a complaint with the commission, and his race, color, and perceived disability. Held: The complainant was unable to show that the respondent's explanation for its actions (the complainant's history of poor work performance) was a pretext for its actions. The complainant was also unable to show that any harassment was so severe or pervasive as to create a hostile work environment.

Wilkerson, 8/10/99
Dacey, Roberta A. v. The Borough of Naugatuck
8330054

Order for relief on remand. Calculation of backpay. Held*:* (1) the complainant vigorously litigated her discrimination claim for damages and is entitled to full amount of backpay; (2) prejudgment interest is an appropriate element in a backpay award; and (3) fringe benefits are an appropriate element in a backpay award.

Wilkerson, 9/2/99
Carey, Edward J. v. Imagineers, LLC
9850104

Motion to stay denied. The commission moved for stay of the proceedings because the complainant had filed an action in federal court. The complainant joined and the respondent did not object. Held*:* Res judicata and collateral estoppel are not valid reasons to grant a stay of proceedings, no duplication of efforts, no unnecessary costs, and discovery by the commission may be used to effect discovery in the federal action. No plausible reason existed to grant stay of proceedings.

Wilkerson, 11/8/99
Tavares, Cori v. Sam's Club, Wal-Mart Stores Inc.
9730092
(decision vacated on appeal by stipulated judgment)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent due to the complainant's failure to appear for the public hearing. Sanctions in the form of attorney fees and court reporter costs imposed against the complainant's attorney.

Wilkerson, 1/14/00
Aguiar, Deborah & Raymond, v. Frenzilli, Nancy & Ralph
9850105

Hearing in damages. The complainants attempted to rent a home from the respondents and the respondents would not allow the complainants to rent because they had small children. Discrimination based on family status. Award for emotional distress damages of $7,500 to the complainant wife and $3,500 to the complainant husband both with 10% post-judgment interest. Also awarded Attorney's fees of $8,236.25.

Wilkerson, 2/2/00
Brelig, Diana Lee v. F&L Inc., d/b/a Luciano's Boathouse Restaurant
9540683

Hearing in damages. Former waitress awarded: (1) Back pay in the amount of $37,616.08; and (2) prejudgment interest in the amount of $3,419.64.

Wilkerson, 9/29/00
Saunders, John J. v. City of Norwalk, Board of Education
9820124
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: (1) the complainant established prima facie case in failure to promote race, age, and color discrimination case and the respondent's proffered legitimate reasons were false thus pretextual; (2) the complainant teacher applied for the position/promotion of assistant principal and was denied position due to his race, age, and color; (3) the respondent did not satisfy its burden of proving the complainant failed to mitigate; (4) Award for back pay damages of $56,390.00 plus pre-and post-judgment interest and front pay of $18,796.67 per year until the respondent offers the complainant the next available assistant principal position or until retirement.

Wilkerson, 1/25/01
Clark, Jeffrey v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.
9830599
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant filed a complaint claiming that he was demoted based on his disability. Held*:* the complainant did not establish a prima facie case under *McDonnell Douglas* proving that he was qualified by showing that he could perform the essential functions of his job with or without reasonable accommodations. The complainant also did not establish a prima facie case under *Price Waterhouse* analysis in that he did not prove that there was direct evidence of discrimination or rebut the respondent's reason for demoting the complainant.

Wilkerson, 10/04/01
Filshtein, Herman v. West Hartford Housing Authority
0050061

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* The respondent discriminated against the complainant who was disabled by failing to reasonably accommodate him in housing. The complainant proved a prima facie case of failure to reasonably accommodate. The respondent did not meet its burden to prove that the accommodation was unreasonable. The complainant was awarded $2,500 for emotional distress damages with post-judgment interest, $7,497 for back rental fees paid with pre- and post-judgment interest, and the complainant's attorney was awarded $5,850 for attorney fees with post-judgment interest. The complainant was also awarded $252 (differential rental fee) per month until the respondent grants him a Section 8 certificate for his current dwelling.

Wilkerson, 11/14/01
Hansen, Joan B. v. W.E.T. National Relocation Services
0020220

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held*:* Under state law, the respondent discriminated against the complainant because of her age, 66, at the time of filing the complaint by terminating her employment. The complainant's federal claim was dismissed because the respondent did not employ at least 20 employees. The complainant proved a prima facie case of age discrimination in employment. The complainant proved that the respondent's proffered reason was unworthy of credence and therefore, pretexual. The complainant was awarded $14,493.00 for back pay with $1,449.00 for prejudgment interest and post-judgment interest at 10% for the unpaid balance.

Wilkerson, 5/23/03
Eckhaus, Eddie, Shirley Banks v.
0250115

Hearing in damages. The complainant who possessed a section 8 voucher attempted to rent a home from the respondent who refused to accept the voucher and would not allow the complainant to apply to rent the house. Discrimination based on lawful source of income and public advertising. The complainant awarded emotional distress damages of $4,500 and attorney fees.

Wilkerson, 5/23/03
Eckhaus, Eddie, Phyllis Hansberry v.
0250114

Hearing in damages. The complainant who possessed section 8 voucher attempted to rent a home from the respondent who refused to accept the voucher and would not allow the complainant to apply to rent the house. Discrimination based on lawful source of income and public advertising. The complainant awarded emotional distress damages of $2,500, $931 for rent differential, $862.94 for storage costs and attorney fees.

Wilkerson, 03/25/04
Matson, Joel v. Dept. of Mental Health & Addictions Services
9930311

Motion for sanctions granted in part; denied in part. The commission on Human Rights and Opportunities requested sanctions imposed on the respondent for failure to comply with the Referee's ruling on a motion to compel which ordered the respondent to produce certain production requests during document discovery. The respondent did not respond to the Motion for Sanctions within the allotted fourteen days per Connecticut Rules of Practice nor did the respondent ever provide pertinent law to support its position not to comply with the order to produce the requested documents. The referee imposed sanctions on the respondent in that an order was entered finding: that the complainant was treated differently (less favorably) than similarly situated employees not in the complainant's protected class; that similarly situated employees not in the complainant's protected class were never placed on administrative leave for having filed work place violation reports; and that respondent is excluded from introducing into evidence documents or testimony regarding the complainant's alleged symptoms or patterns of retaliation and recrimination used as a defense.

Wilkerson, 9/9/04
Samuel, Henrietta Lorraine Stevens v. Pond Point Health Care Center d/b/a Lexington Health Care
0230332

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to appear at a hearing conference and failure to file an answer. The respondent had terminated/suspended and harassed the complainant multiple times during her employment with the respondent. Discrimination and retaliation based on race, color (Black) and physical disability (hypertension cardiac). The complainant was awarded $17,788.95 for back pay and $1,778.89 for prejudgment interest and 10% per year for postjudgment interest.

Wilkerson, 11/29/05
Dwyer, Erin v. Yale University
0130315, 0230323

Final decision. Judgment, in part, for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against the complainant by 1) failing to respond to her continued reports of workplace harassment by both co-workers and management; 2) by treating her dissimilarly to other employees in trial periods; and 3) by suspending and ultimately terminating her because she is a transgendered woman with a mental disability who was, or was perceived to be homosexual, and in retaliation for participating in the University's grievance process and filing a CHRO complaint. Held*:* The respondent violated General Statutes § 46a-81c(1) by creating a hostile work environment based on the complainant's sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation during her employment at one of its facilities when it failed to take reasonable steps to remedy the hostile work environment. The respondent is liable to the complainant for her injuries. The complainant is entitled to an award of back pay along with 10% pre and post-judgment interest. The commission and the complainant failed to prove that the respondent discriminated, retaliated or aided and abetted discrimination against the complainant for the lost promotions, demotions, poor evaluations, being placed on probation, failure to accommodate, and the suspension and termination and those claims are dismissed.

Wilkerson, 02/08/06
Graves, Jr., David v. Sno White Avenue Car Wash
0330082

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held: The complainant proved that the respondent's proffered business reason for terminating his employment was false, but he failed to prove that the false reason was a pretext for discrimination. The record revealed non-discriminatory reasons for the termination and, therefore, the complainant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the respondent terminated him because of his Puerto Rican ancestry.

Wilkerson, 08/30/07
Lenotti, David L. v. City of Stamford
0520402

Motion to dismiss denied. Held*:* an alleged discriminatory decision to deny the complainant an accommodation made prior to the 180 days of the filing of the complaint that was referenced in a second alleged discriminatory decision to deny an accommodation that was made within the 180 days of the filing the complaint shall not be dismissed as untimely. The allegation outside of the 180 days is relevant because it directly relates to the timely made allegations of the complaint and shows that the respondent engaged in a pattern of discriminatory practice.

Wilkerson, 09/21/07
McIntosh-Waller, Marcia v. Donna & David Vahlstrom
0750080

Motion to dismiss granted in part; denied in part. Held*:* the complainant has standing to bring a housing discrimination complaint against her neighbors alleging a hostile housing environment in which the respondents harassed and intimidated her and her family because of the complainant's race and ancestry. The complainant stated a claim for which relief can be granted as the only party complainant to this complaint. The complainant stated a cause of action under General Statutes § 46a-64c (a) (9), Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. § 3617); and 42 U.S.C. § 1982 for a violation of her rights to use and enjoy her property. The complainant did not state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 because she did not allege that a contractual relationship existed between her and the respondents, which the respondents interfered with or prevented because of her race.

Wilkerson, 11/14/07
Ali, Liaquiat v Bridgeport, City of,
0750131 & 0750132

Motion to dismiss denied. The respondents (City of Bridgeport and Bridgeport planning and zoning commission) moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction as to the city arguing that the city had no authority to amend or enforce the zoning regulations. CHRO argued that the complaint against alleged discrimination in housing and was not an appeal of a zoning regulation. Held*:* the city shall remain a respondent because it is inferred that the planning and zoning commission is an authorized decision-maker for the city and acted as a policy maker for the city when it enforced the zoning regulations.

Wilkerson Brillant, 04/08/08
Lenotti, David L. v City of Stamford
0520402
(on appeal, stipulated judgment*)*

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. Held: The respondent discriminated against the complainant by failing to accommodate the complainant's learning disability when it denied him a reasonable accommodation to take an exam. The respondent failed to engage in an interactive process with the complainant. The respondent did not prove its safety defense or its defense that the exam was job-related. The complainant's claims of failure to promote, denied raise and differential rate of pay are dismissed. The complainant was awarded the accommodation of additional time to take the captain promotional exam and if he obtained the required score, he was awarded the captain position. If no captain position is available, the respondent would pay the complainant the difference in the captain and lieutenant salaries.

Wilkerson Brillant, 04/28/08
Correa, Jocelin v. La Casona Restaurant
0710004

Hearing in damages. Held: pursuant to the default order, the respondents were liable for discriminating against the complainant because of her pregnancy when they discharged her from employment. The complainant was awarded $19,404.88 for back pay, 10% pre-judgment interest of $1940.49, $2500 in emotional distress damages and post judgment interest of 10% per annum from the date of the final decision. The discriminatory act was not done in public and was not highly egregious; the emotional distress was not long in duration; and the consequences of the discrimination were not found to be directly linked to the discriminatory act. The respondent was ordered to cease and desist from discriminatory practices, not to retaliate against the complainant and to post the commission's antidiscrimination posters in its workplace.

Wilkerson Brillant, 07/16/08
Baroudjian, Philip v. North East Transportation Company, Inc.
0430505
(appeal dismissed)

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged discrimination in the terms and conditions of his employment on the basis of his race, color, alienage, national origin and ancestry (Arabic). Held: The commission and the complainant failed to prove under both the mixed motive and pretext analyses that the respondent discriminated against the complainant by treating him differently than non-basis similarly situated employees because of his ancestry and national origin (Arabic) when it suspended him for one day and warned him.

Wilkerson Brillant, 07/25/08
Collette, Yvonne v. University of Connecticut Health Center
0610446

Motion to dismiss granted in part; denied in part. Held: (1) because the complaint was amended as a matter of right prior to the appointment of the undersigned presiding referee pursuant to § 46a-54-38a (a) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the state law

claims are not time-barred; (2) the complainant's basis for her § 46a-58 (a) claim is not a cause of action under § 46a-60 but is a cause of action under the federal ADA and, thus, the complainant's federal ADA claim has been converted to a claim under state law by way of § 46a-58 (a) and is a valid claim; (3) § 46a-70 applies to employment discrimination in state agencies and the respondent's alleged failure to provide a reasonable accommodation in order for the complainant to resume working is covered within § 46a-70; and (4) Section 46a-77 applies to services provided to the public by state agencies and does not apply to employment discrimination claims, therefore, the complainant does not state a valid claim under § 46a-77 and her claims pursuant to § 46a-77 are dismissed.

Wilkerson Brillant, 12/29/08
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge
0640147

Motion to amend the complaint to add a respondent: denied without prejudice: Held: the named respondent, Germania Lodge, the employer, is separate and distinct from Germania Lodge, the membership organization that is a subordinate of the Order of Hermann's Sons. The complainant did not establish that the entity to be added as a respondent, Order of Hermann's Sons, met the criteria of the identity or instrumentality rules in order to pierce the corporate veil. There was no evidence that the Order of Hermann's Sons had control over the employer, Germania Lodge's finances and employment policies and/or business practices. Also, there was no evidence that there existed a unity of interest and ownership for the Order of Hermann's Sons and Germania Lodge as an employer. The evidence showed that as an employer, Germania Lodge is an independent entity with separate funds and policies to conduct its employment operations.

Wilkerson Brillant, 03/03/09
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge
0640147

Motion to amend granted. The complainant alleged in her original complaint that the respondent violated General Statutes §§ 46a-60 (a) (1) and 46a-58 (a) when it discriminated against her because of her sex when it terminated her employment and denied her membership in its social club. She also alleged the respondent retaliated against her by terminating her because she applied for membership in its social club. The complainant requested that her complaint be amended to add violations of §§ 46a-63 and 46a-64 (a) (public accommodation and she also identified that the respondent as Germania Lodge. The respondent argued that the public accommodation claim had not been fully investigated prior to certification of the complaint and therefore its due process rights would be violated if the amendment were granted. The complaint had originally been dismissed by the investigator's finding of no reasonable cause which did include limited findings on the public accommodation issue. The complainant's reconsideration request was granted and the executive director's decision on reconsideration directed further investigations on the public accommodation claim. Subsequently, the investigator issued a finding of reasonable cause on the complainant's termination, public accommodation and retaliation claims.

Held*:* Because the claim of public accommodation discrimination was alleged in the original complaint and had been investigated and because there was, after reconsideration, a finding of reasonable cause on the entire complaint, the respondent was fully aware of the public accommodation discrimination claim. More importantly, the public hearing process is not to be used as an appeal of the investigator's processing of the complaint pursuant to Section 46a-84 (b). Therefore, the motion to amend is granted allowing the public accommodation claim. However, the complainant's retaliation claim is dismissed because her allegation that the respondent retaliated against her because she applied for membership in the respondent's social club is not protected activity pursuant to § 46a-60 (a) (4).

Wilkerson Brillant, 05/19/09
Weichman, Ann D. v. Dept. of Environmental Protection
0710348

Motion to dismiss granted in part; denied in part. The complainant alleged that the respondent failed to accommodate her disability, subjected her to unequal terms and conditions of employment and terminated her because of her physical disability and her age in violation of General Statutes §§ 46a-58 (a), 46a-60 (a) (1), 46a-70, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) and the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). The respondent moved to dismiss the complaint arguing this tribunal lacked subject matter jurisdiction because the doctrine of sovereign immunity bars the state claims, the § 46a-70 claim applies to named state officials, and that § 46a-58 (a) did not cover the federal claims. Ruling: The complainant’s state claims fall within the exceptions of §§ 4-142 (2) and (3), and § 46a-70 applies to employment discrimination in state agencies where no individual state officials are named defendants. The complainant’s ADA and Title VII claims are covered under § 46a-58 (a), but age is not a protected class under § 46a-58 (a) and therefore complainant’s ADEA claim is dismissed.

Wilkerson Brillant, 07/1/09
Roberts, Cheryl v. Germania Lodge Building
0640147

Motion for sanctions: granted in part; denied in part. The respondent moved for sanctions against the complainant for her failure to produce documents as ordered. The respondent was seeking documents, specifically income tax returns, pertaining to the complainant’s damages calculation including her earned income from the respondent’s employ and her mitigation obligation. The complainant had provided inconsistent reasons for not providing the documents as ordered. The commission and the complainant were precluded from introducing any evidence related to the complainant’s income tax returns or relevant income information.

Wilkerson Brillant, 11/13/09
Braffith, Samuel v. Peter Pan Bus Lines
0540183

Motion in limine denied. The respondent moved to exclude evidence regarding the complainant's emotional distress damages because it posited that the commission does not have the authority to award emotional distress damages in employment discrimination cases where § 46a-60 is alleged. This tribunal awards emotional distress damages based on the premise that when a respondent has violated a federal law, e.g., Title VII, covered under § 46a-58 (a); then remedies under § 46a-86 (c), which include emotional distress damages, are available.

Wilson, 02/27/2012
Taylor, Thaddeus v Salvation ARC
1010252

Ruling. The complainant's motion to amend his complaint denied as he had previously obtained a release of jurisdiction.

Wilson, 03/25/2013
Mayo, Alfred Parker v Bauer, Inc.
0831066

Motion to dismiss granted. At the conclusion of the complainant's case, the respondent moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to establish a prima facie case. Motion granted pursuant to section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies because the complainant failed to present evidence of a discriminatory motive in the respondent's decision to terminate his employment and failed to produce evidence that he was qualified for the position.

Wilson, 06/03/2013
Franuenhofer, Ann v Ascent Service & Technologies, LLC
1010090

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent terminated her employment because of her participation in a protective activity. *Held*: the complainant's evidence failed to establish that the respondent's proffered legitimate business reason was a pretext for retaliation or to show that the respondent possessed a retaliatory motive.

Wilson, 07/03/2013
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp.
0920414 (1120319)

Motion to dismiss the General Statute Section 46a-58 is granted. The complainant alleges in part that the respondent discriminated against her on the basis of her age in violation of General Statute Section 46a-60(a)(1), and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act as enforced through General Statute Section 46a-58. Age is not one of the enumerated protected classes in Section 46a-58.

Wilson, 07/03/2013
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp.
0920414 (1120319)

Respondent's motion to dismiss the Section 46a-60 claims for lack of jurisdiction is denied because at the time of the filing of the complaint the respondent had at least three employees of whom at least one was employed in Connecticut.

Wilson, 11/22/2013
Browne, Philip v Dept of Correction
1230423

Motion to dismiss. The respondent moved to dismiss the complainant's claims under General Statute Section 46a-60(a)(1) and (4) claims for failure to state a cause of action. *Held*: motion to dismiss denied but, treating the motion as a motion to strike, the complainant ordered to file an amended complainant regarding his Section 46a-60(a)(4) claim.

Wilson, 11/26/2013
Brown, Philip v Dept of Correction
1130416

Motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action. Motion denied. *Held*: when construed broadly and in a manner most favorable to the complainant, the fact alleged and necessarily implied are sufficient to state a claim.

Wilson, 12/13/2013
Toepelt, Rochelle v. Nailtique aks Nailtique, Inc.
0720118

Hearing in damages. Default entered for failure to file an answer in a denial of services case predicated upon disability discrimination. The complainant was awarded $250 in emotional distress damages and $445.76 in damages.

Wilson, 06/13/2014
Latef, Roberts v Judicial Department, State of Connecticut
1030184

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. *Held*: evidence presented failed to establish that the respondent articulated reason for failing to hire the complainant as a permanent employee at the end of his probation period, because he had not acquired the necessary skills, was a pretext for discrimination.

Wilson, 09/19/2014
DuBois, Barbara v Maharam Fabric Corp.
0920414

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant filed two complaints, 0920414 and 1120319, in which she alleged in her first complaint that illegally terminated her employment because of her age and, in her second complaint, later refused to hire her in retaliation for her filing of the first complaint. *Held*: there was insufficient evidence to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reasons for the actions it took.

Wilson, 01/16/2015
McKinney, Kirk v Town of Glastonbury Fire Dept.
1140156

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated General Statutes section 46a-60(a)(1), 46a-64(a)(1), 46a-74 and 46a-76 when it refused him to retain his position as deputy chief because he had turned 66 years old. *Held*: General Statute Section 46a-60(b)(1)(C) creates a statutory exclusion from the age discrimination protections found in section 46a-60(a) for firefighters. Further, that prohibitions against discrimination in access to and enjoyment of public accommodations, pursuant to section 46a-64 to not extend to employment by any enterprise defined, pursuant to section 46a-63(1) to be a place of public accommodation. Employment discrimination by places of public accommodation, resort or amusement are regulated by sections 46a-58m 46a-60 and 46a-81c.

Wilson, 03/02/2015
Kitchens, John v Specialty Transportation
1010206

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. Held: The evidence failed to establish that the respondent terminated the complainant's employment because of his age.

Wilson, 04/06/2015
Hudson, Betsy v New London Public Schools
0840264

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent demoted and transferred her because of her race and sex. *Held*: the complainant did not establish a prima facie case because there was insufficient evidence to create an inference of discriminatory animus based on her protected status. Further, even if the complainant established a prima facie case, the complainant failed to rebut the respondent's legitimate business reason.

Wilson, 09/10/2015
Lopez, Patricia v Subway Stratford LLC
1120261

Hearing in damages. Respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $44,033 in back pay, $3000 in attorney's fees, $500 in emotional distress damages and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to reimburse the state $18,179 in unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Wilson, 10/01/2015
George, Thomas v Town of West Hartford
0910466

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that the respondent violated the Americans with Disabilities Act as enforced under General Statute 46a-58(a) when it failed to make a modification to its refuse and recycling collection services. *Held:* the it is not a violation of the ADA for a public entity to refuse to perform any function for the benefit of any individual that exceeds their physical abilities so long as the public entity does not perform that service for able-bodied resident.

Wilson, 12/07/2015
Artis, Carnell v Kelly Services, C. Kostas and Covidien LP dba Covidien
1230079 (1230080, 1230184)

Motion for directed verdict following the presentation of the complainant's case granted. The complainant filed three complainants alleging race and age discrimination, retaliation, and aiding and abetting. Following one day of trial, the respondent moved for a directed verdict on the grounds that the complainant submitted no evidence of discriminatory animus. *Held*: motion granted pursuant to Regulation 46a-54-78a (4) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Wilson, 12/07/2015
Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center
1330398

Motion to dismiss as to the University of Connecticut Health Center. *Held*: the motion to dismiss as to the University of Connecticut Health Center (UCHC) granted. The complainant filed his complaint against the Department of Correction on March 25, 2013 and filed an amendment on September 15, 2014 to add the UCHC as a respondent. The amendment exceeds the 180-day statutory filing period of any alleged discriminatory conduct by UCHC and there is no evidence to support equitable tolling or constructive notice.

Wilson, 12/07/2005
Roig, Peter v Dept of Correction and the Univ of Connecticut Health Center
1330398

Motion to strike as to the Department of Correction. *Held*: motion granted in part and denied in part. Motion granted as to claims under Section 46a-64(a) and 46a-74 as the Department of Correction is not a public accommodation. Motion denied as to claims under Section 46a71 and 46a-77.

Wilson, 12/07/2015
Garcia, Dionne v CT Family Care LLC
1340202

Corrected Hearing in Damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant awarded backpay of $4,650 and post-judgment interest.

Wilson, 12/08/2015
Schopick, Andrew v. Nutmeg Securities, Fieldpoint Private Bank & Trust, M. Rochlin
1123092, 1120439, 1120440

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent in part and for the complainant in part. The complainant alleged that Nutmeg discriminated against him on the basis of his age in terminating his employment and had retaliated against him for his previous opposition to a discriminatory practice. He alleged that Rochlin had also retaliated against him and aided and abetted Nutmeg Securities in its retaliatory action. He further alleged that Fieldpoint discriminated against him on the basis of his age, aided and abetted in the retaliatory actions taken against him, and was liable for the violations committed by Nutmeg Securities as its successor in interest. *Held*: Age discrimination claim against Nutmeg dismissed because it terminated the complainant's employment because of low production, not because of age discrimination. Nutmeg and Rochlin retaliated against the complainant but no damages were awarded because there was no proof of damages. Complaint against Fieldpoint dismissed because no liability found against Nutmeg as to age discrimination.

Wilson, 12/10/2015
Baker, Sandra v Hartford Public Schools
1310147

Motion to dismiss. Motion granted in part and denied in part. *Held:* motion granted as to the Section 46a-58(a) claim seeking to enforce Title VII, the 46a-64(a) claim and the 46a-75 claim. Motion denied as to the 46a-58(a) claim seeking to enforce General Statute 10-15c.

Wilson, 12/10/2015
Sokolowski, Andrea v Trinity Christian School
1230397

Motion to dismiss. This is the respondent's second motion to dismiss (see Sokolowski v Trinity Christian Church, 1110391, 02/01/2013) in which it again argued that the commission lacks subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the ministerial exception under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Held*: motion denied. At this stage of the proceeding, with no evidentiary hearing, the respondent has not established that the complainant's duties are inextricably intertwined with the school's mission.

Wilson, 12/10/2015
Turner, Tammy v Dept. of Developmental Services
1010190

Final decision. Judgment for the respondent. *Held*: the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's decision to terminate her employment was motivated by discriminatory

animus and failed to establish the respondent failed to provide her with a reasonable accommodation.

Wilson, 03/04/2016
Saraceno, Cindy v Midstate Medical Center
1130445

Motion to strike. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her when it terminated her employment because of her mental disorder. The respondent moved to strike the complaint on the grounds that the facts as pleaded did not establish that the complainant suffered from a mental disability at the time of her termination and, therefore, fails to state a claim for mental disability discrimination. *Held*: Motion denied. While the complaint may be poorly drafted, the facts as alleged and those that are necessarily employed disclose the bare essentials to state a claim or which relief can be granted and are sufficient to apprise the opposing party of what is meant to be proved.

Wright, 03/31/2016
Lauray, Mark v City Hall Café
1530333

Hearing in damages. The respondent defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $831 in backpay and $8,000 in emotional distress damages.

Wright, 06/14/2016
Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc.
1110081

Final decision. Judgement for the respondent. The complainant alleged that he was terminated because of his age and/ or disability. *Held:* the complainant failed to establish that the respondent's proffered business reason for the termination, declining job performance, was a pretext for discrimination.

Wright, 07/26/2016
Weinz, Barry v Bill Selig Jewelers, Inc.
1110081

Ruling on motion for reconsideration of final decision of judgment for the respondent. Final decision clarified regarding direct evidence and stray remark. Reconsideration denied.

Wright. 04/04/2017
Treacy, Kathy v Vitas Innovative Hospice Care
1320021

Final decision. Judgment for the complainant. The complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her in the terms and conditions of her employment based on her learning disability and/or mental disorder. *Held*: the complainant established her prima facie case and that the respondent's articulated reasons for terminating the employment relationship were a pretext for intentional discrimination. The complainant was awarded $73,401.30 in backpay; $43,877.03 in prejudgment interest on the backpay; and $6,253.44 in reimbursement for travel expenses.

Wright, 06/12/2017
Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon
1550288 (appeal pending)
Wright, 06/12/2017

Hearing in damages. Housing, hostile housing environment

Hearing in damages. The complainant alleged that her neighbor, the respondent, harassed and threatened her on the basis of her race and color. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $157.15 in reimbursement for travel

expenses and $15,000 in emotional distress damages. *(On appeal, remanded for further consideration of damages in light of Patino v Birken Manufacturing Co., 304 Conn 679 (2012).*

Wright. 08/17/2018
Howard, Kelly v Richard Cantillon
1550288 (appeal pending)

Hearing in damages on remand. The complainant alleged that her neighbor, the respondent, harassed and threatened her on the basis of her race and color. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $157.15 in reimbursement for travel expenses and $15,000 in emotional distress damages.

Wright, 09/06/2018
Hogan, Ashley v H&H Promotions, Inc.
1720211

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $12,120 in backpay, $30,000 in emotional distress damages, and post-judgement interest.

Wright, 10/09/2018
Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection
0910275 (appeal pending)

Motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. CHRO has subject matter jurisdiction over the complainant's allegations that the respondent denied his application for a professional engineering license under Class 4 reciprocity because of his national origin and criminal record. Nonetheless, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to section 46a-54-88a(d) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and the complainant is ordered to fil a revised complaint.

Wright, 12/12/2018
Taylor, David v Dept. of Consumer Protection
0910275

Complaint dismissed for failure to comply with prior order to file a revised complaint.

Wright, 01/03/2019
Demmerle, Mark v New England Stair Co.
1730020

Motion to dismiss. The complainant alleged that the respondent retaliated against him for his previous filing of an employment discrimination complaint against the respondent, then his employer. The alleged act of retaliation was an email sent to the complainant by the respondent's senior vice president of sales which the complainant found threatening. In its motion to dismiss, the respondent contends that the commission does not have subject

matter jurisdiction over post-employment actions involving of a former employee and because the adverse action complained of involved the exercise of protected constitutional or statutory rights and privileges of the respondent. *Held*: motion denied. There is no evidence constitutional rights or privileges implicated in this claim of retaliation and the facts as alleged and those necessarily implied are sufficient to state a cause of action for retaliation.

Wright, 02/22/2019
Danner, Stephanie v ATOS IT Solutions and Services, Inc.
1730314 (on appeal, remanded)

Motion for summary judgment. In her complaint, the complainant alleged that the respondent discriminated against her on the basis of her mental disability and retaliated against her. In its motion for summary judgment, the respondent argued that the complainant cannot establish the prima facie elements of her case because there was no reasonable accommodation that it could provide to enable her to perform the essential functions of her job. Further, it argued that the complainant could not refute its legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for terminating her employment, namely layoffs over an extended period of time. The respondent filed supporting affirmative evidence and affidavits in support of its position. The complainant provided no affidavits or other evidence to establish a factual basis for the challenged elements. *Held*: motion granted. The complainant and commission failed to offer any counter affidavits or evidentiary material to demonstrate the existence of genuine issues of material facts.

Wright, 08/14/2019
Ramirez, Ezequiel v Smart Home Preservation
1730247

Hearing in damages. *Held*: Complaint dismissed for failure to comply with all requisite procedural notices and jurisdictional requirements.

Wright, 0814/2019
Tineo, Leonicio v Smart Choice Preservation
1730253

Hearing in damages. *Held*: the complainant awarded $2,378 in backpay; $45,000 in emotional distress damages and pre- and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $7,008 as reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

Wright, 08/14/2019
Morales-Martinez, Robinson v Smart Home Preservation
1730254

Hearing in damages. The respondent was defaulted for failure to file an answer. The complainant was awarded $25,572 in backpay, $45,000 in emotional distress damages, and pre- and post-judgment interest. The respondent was further ordered to pay the state $13,312 in reimbursement for unemployment compensation paid to the complainant.

N. B. Decisions of the human rights referees and regulations of the commission can be accessed through the commission's website at: www.ct.gov/chro