STATE OF INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

ICRC No.: EMsh11040161 EEOC No.: 24F-2011-00266

KARA MOORE,

Complainant,

v.

KING GYROS OF ANGELO'S INC., Respondent.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

On July 23, 2013, Noell F. Allen Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") for the Indiana Civil Rights Commission ("ICRC") entered her Proposed Findings Of Fact, Conclusions Of Law, And Order as amended ("the proposed decision").

No objections have been filed to the ICRC's adoption of the proposed decision.

Having carefully considered the foregoing and being duly advised in the premises, the ICRC hereby adopts as its own the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order proposed by the ALJ in the proposed decision, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIØNER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONE

Dated this 23rd Day of August, 2013.

To be served by first class mail on the following parties:

Kara A. Moore 1106 South Jefferson Mason, Michigan 48854

MISHLER & NEWCOMB, LLP BY: William R. Mishler, Esq. 123 North Center Street P.O. Box 56 Bremen, IN 46506-0056

King Gyro's c/o Wasim K. Latif 1827 ½ Michigan Street Plymouth, IN 46563-1007

and to be personally served on the following attorney:

Frederick S. Bremer, Esq.; Staff Attorney Indiana Civil Rights Commission Indiana Government Center North 100 North Senate Avenue, Room N103 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2255

STATE OF INDIANA INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

KARA MOORE, Docket No.: EMsh11040161 Complainant, EEOC No.: 24F-2011-00266 vs. KING GYROS OF ANGELO'S INC., Respondent.

AMENDED PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

A Hearing on Damages was held in this case before Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") Robert D. Lange ("Judge Lange") for the Indiana Civil Rights Commission ("ICRC") on September 5, 2012. Complainant, Kara A. Moore ("Moore"), appeared in person and was represented by William Mishler, Attorney at Law at MISHLER & NEWCOMB, LLP. Respondent, King Gyros of Angelo's, Inc., ("Respondent") did not appear, by counsel or otherwise.

An opening statement was waived. Moore testified on her own behalf.

After Complainant rested, the cause was taken under advisement. The ALJ ordered Complainant to submit what he suggested he enter as proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and order on or before October 5, 2012.

On October 3, 2012, Complainant filed Complainant, Kara Moore's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

Judge Lange retired from his position as ALJ from the ICRC on December 26, 2012. On July 2, 2013, the Commission appointed Noell F. Allen,

undersigned ALJ, as ALJ for this matter. On July 3, 2013, Judge Allen adopted Complainant's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

Having carefully considered the foregoing and being duly advised in the premises, the ALJ proposed that the ICRC enter the following as findings of fact, conclusions of law and a final order as amended.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Moore filed her complaint against Respondent on April 13, 2011, stating employment discrimination on the basis of sex, specifically sexual harassment.
- 2. On or about February 3, 2012, Respondent was served with a NOTICE OF INITIAL PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE that was scheduled for February 27, 2012 at 8:30 A.M. in Room 1 of the Conference Center on the first floor of the Indiana Government Center South at 302 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN. The Notice of Initial Pre-Hearing Conference advised Respondent that "a party who fails to attend or participate in a Pre-Hearing Conference, Hearing, or later stage of the proceedings may be held in default or the matter may be dismissed."
- 3. The Respondent did not appear or participate in the Initial Pre-Hearing Conference.
- 4. On July 30, 2012, the ALJ entered and served his NOTICE OF PROPOSED DEFAULT ORDER ("NPDO"). The NPDO advised Respondent that it could file a written motion requesting that the proposed default order not be imposed and stating the grounds upon which they relied within seven (7) days after service of the NPDO. The NPDO also advised that if no such motion is filed, the ALJ MUST enter the proposed default order under IC 4-21.5-3-24(c).
- 5. Respondent did not file a written motion requesting that the proposed default order not be imposed.
- 6. On August 14, 2012, the ALJ issued his ORDER BY DEFAULT AND NOTICE OF HEARING ON DAMAGES.
- 7. As alleged in Moore's complaint, that must be accepted as true: a. On March 6, 2011, Moore felt compelled to quit her job

- b. Moore believed she had been discriminated against on the basis of her sex/sexual harassment because
 - i. On March 6, 2011, Moore quit her job due to a hostile work environment.
 - ii. During the employment, Moore was sexually harassed by the male co-workers on a continuous basis.
 - iii. Moore complained to the owner, Wasilm Latif; however, nothing was done to correct the abuse Moore endured on a daily basis, and it left Moore afraid to go to work.
- 8. Moore earned \$6.00 per hour and worked fifty (50) hours per week for the Respondent. Therefore, Moore earned \$300.00 per week.
- 9. Moore's lost wages from the time of separation through the end of litigation was \$22,500.00.
- 10. Since separating from work, Moore obtained employment with Pro Resources and earned approximately \$3,000.00 in total gross wages.
- 11. Moore incurred expenses by way of attorney's fees and traveling expenses to participate in the pre-hearing conference.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The ICRC has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties.
- 2. Moore and Respondent are each a "person", as that term is defined in section 3(a) of the Indiana Civil Rights Law, Ind. Code 22-9-1-1 et seq. ("ICRL"); Ind. Code 22-9-1-3(a).
- 3. The Respondent is an "employer", as that term is defined in the ICRL, Ind. Code 22-9-1-3(h).
- 4. The ICRC's Rule 6.1 (1) provides, in material part, that "[w]hen a party has failed to appear for a public hearing after proper notice", that party is in default. 910 IAC 1-6-1(2).
- 5. Default is appropriate under 910 IAC 1-6-1(2).
- 6. The ALJ was required to conduct further proceedings after default without the participation of Respondents. IC 4-21.5-3-24(d).
- 7. The effects of an order by default include that the allegations of the complaint are deemed admitted.

- 8. What constitutes as discriminatory practice is set out in the following subsection of the ICRL:
- 9. "Discriminatory practice" means: (1) the exclusion of a person from equal opportunities because of ... sex ... Ind. Code 22-9-1-3(1)(1).
- 10. "The United States Supreme Court has held that a plaintiff may establish a violation of Title VII by proving that discrimination based on sex has created a hostile or abusive work environment."

 Meritor Sav. Bank, FSB v. Vinson, 477 U.S. 57, 66 (1986).
- 11. The ICRL makes it a discriminatory practice to exclude a person from equal opportunities because of, among other things, sex. Ind. Code 22-9-1-3(1)(1). Every discriminatory practice related to, among other things, employment, is unlawful unless exempted by the IRCL. Id.
- 12. If the ICRC finds that a person has committed an unlawful discriminatory practice, it shall issue an order requiring the person to cease and desist from that practice and to take further affirmative action as will effectuate the purposes of the ICRL, which may include restoring Complainant's losses incurred as a result of the discriminatory treatment. IC 22-9-1-6(k)(A).
- 13. If the ICRC finds that a person has committed a discriminatory practice, it "may order the appropriate relief, including actual damages, …and other injunctive or equitable relief." IC 22-9.5-6-15(a).
- 14. 10. "Actual damages" includes compensation for emotional distress. Indiana Civil Rights Commission v. Alder, 714 N.E.2d 632 (Ind. 1999). Three Thousand Dollars (\$3,000.00) is an appropriate amount in this case.
- 15. Moore has proven that she sustained lost earnings that were the proximate result of the proven unlawful discriminatory practice.
- 16. The loss of the use of wages is a part of the loss that a complainant incurs when those wages are lost. Thus, the awarding of interest to compensate for the loss of use is within the authority of the ICRC.
- 17. Interest should be awarded at an annual rate of 8% compounded annually. This is the rate provided for in IC 24-4.6-1-103, a statute that is appropriate to consult in the absence of a more

- applicable statute. *Indiana Insurance Company v. Sentry Insurance Company*, 437 N.E.2d 1381 (Ind. App.1982).
- 18. The burden of proof on the issue of mitigation of damages is on the wrongdoer. *Colonial Discount Corp. v. Berkhardt*, 435 N.E. 2d 65 (Ind. App.1982).
- 19. Moore's lost wages of \$22,500.00 less the interim wages earned from Pre Resources for \$3,000 equals \$19,500. That amount multiplied by interest is \$21,060.00.
- 20. Moore is entitled to the reasonable attorney's fees for \$5,000.00.
- 21. Moore requests compensatory and putative damages as a result of her constructive discharge. However, the Court has long held that putative damages (awards to punish the Respondent) are not within the authority of the Commission to award. *Indiana Civil Rights Comm'n v. Alder*, 714 N.E.2d 632, 638 (Ind. App. 1999).
- 22. Administrative review of this proposed decision may be obtained by any interested and affected person who is not in default by the filing of a writing specifying with reasonable particularity each basis for each objection within 15 days after service of this proposed decision. IC 4-21.5-23-29(d).
- 23. Any Finding of Fact that should have been deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

ORDER

- Respondent shall cease and desist from creating a hostile work environment for all employees.
- 2. Respondent shall deliver to the ICRC one or more cashier's checks payable to the ICRC, as escrow agent for Moore, in amounts adding up to \$29,060.00 less appropriate employee withholding taxes from lost wages (\$19,500.00).
- 3. This Order shall take effect immediately after it is approved and signed by a majority of the members of ICRC, unless it is modified by ICRC pursuant to IC 4-21.5-3-31(a), stayed by

ICRC under 4-21.5-3-31(b), or stayed by a court of competent 1 jurisdiction. 2 3 4 Dated this 25th day of July, 2013 5 6 7 Administrative Law Judge 8 9 To be served by first class mail on the following parties and attorneys of record: 10 To be served by first class mail on the following parties: 11 Kara A. Moore 12 1106 South Jefferson Mason, Michigan 48854 13 MISHLER & NEWCOMB, LLP 14 BY: William R. Mishler, Esq. 123 North Center Street 15 P.O. Box 56 Bremen, IN 46506-0056 16 King Gyro's 17 c/o Wasim K. Latif 1827 ½ Michigan Street 18 Plymouth, IN 46563-1007 19 and to be personally served on the following attorney: 20 Frederick S. Bremer, Esq.; Staff Attorney Indiana Civil Rights Commission 21 Indiana Government Center North 100 North Senate Avenue, Room N103 22 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2255 23 24 25 26

27

28