


1:14 o'clock p.m. April 15, 2024

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: It's 1:14 on my clock, so we'll go ahead and begin our monthly Civil Rights Commission meeting, and would you like to announce the agenda, please?

MR. LOSTUTTER: The agenda will be as follows: We will have approval of previous meeting minutes; we will then have the ICRC Director's Report; then we'll have the Old Business of listening to appeals that were assigned to Commissioners last month; and then we will have New Business, appeals to be assigned to Commissioners for next month; we then have a review of ALJ Decisions and Orders; and we then have reading in of the one ALJ decision that's automatically confirmed; then we can talk about next month's meeting set for May 20th, make sure that people will be available for that; and then we have the matter of election of Chair and Vice-Chair.

And that's the agenda for today.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. We need a motion to approve the minutes.

COMM. TOLLIVER: So moved.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Yes -- or excuse
me. First, we need to establish a quorum.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Oh, correct. And
we do have a quorum. We have five of the seven, and we know Chair Slash is enjoying someplace warm, I'm sure, and so, we do have a quorum. Thank you.

Okay. Now for approval of the minutes, I heard Comm. Tolliver make the motion to approve. Was there a second?

COMM. SILBERBERG: Second.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Second by
Comm. Silberberg.

Since there's no one on-line, we can just do a voice vote. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.

COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.

COMM. JACKSON: Aye.

COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries.

Then we have the Indiana Civil Rights Commission Director's Report.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Thank you,
Vice-Chair Ramos.
Just a few things to go over today. We do have some events going on this month. April is National Fair Housing Month. We're hosting a Fair Housing virtual panel on April 25 th in the afternoon. I'm actually moderating it, and Melissa Deering, our REPACE Division Director, is one of our panelists, and then we have a panelist from the Indiana Housing Community Development Authority and somebody from the Division on Mental Health and Addiction from the FSSA joining us talking about housing-related matters.

So, we anticipate having a good audience for that, and if you've not yet been invited, we'll make sure that invitations get out to the

Commissioners as well. And that's on April 25 th at 2:00 o'clock.

And then starting next month, we'll be doing -- we're getting back into our C.O.R.E. activities, which is Community, Outreach and Resource and Education, where we have staff from our office out at local libraries or community centers to be there to raise awareness, educate the public, and to be there for intake purposes as well, if somebody has a complaint that they want to file. So, they'll be able to work with that individual to get complaints filed.

So, we've got that. We'll get that fired up here in the next couple of weeks, and we're working with a group up in Northwestern Indiana to do C.O.R.E. events up there as well, to serve a number of the populations and the cities up in the Northwest Indiana area, outside of our area. MR. LOSTUTTER: And Executive Director Greg Wilson is on.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Can you mute everyone? All right.
Just a couple of legislative-related
things. As you've heard, House Enrolled Act 1003 was passed. That's the one that transfers ultimate authority to the Office of

Administrative Law Proceedings, the ALJ's through that agency.

That becomes effective on July 1st, so
cases that are initiated prior to July 1st, this Commission will retain ultimate authority status for those cases, but then cases that are initiated after July 1st, the Administrative Law Judge in OALP is then the ultimate authority for those particular cases.

So, all of the cases currently going through the administrative process and any that are initiated between now and June 30th, this Commission would still retain the ultimate authority status for those cases.

And then last year there was House Enrolled Act 1623. That was passed, and it had to deal with some administrative law stuff, but also civil penalties and fines, and as part of that, there was a safe-harbor provision, where agencies needed to come in if they had some type
of civil penalty or fee that they were able to issue, which this Commission does have the civil penalty that's permitted in Fair Housing cases.

So, on -- actually on Friday I'm going before the Budget Committee to talk about that civil penalty and what our plans are with it, because the statutory language provides that it's an "up-to" penalty, and neither our statute nor our regulations provide any guidance on what that "up-to" should look like.

So, over this next year, we're going to be engaged in some rulemaking to bring in -- on the federal level and their regulations in the Federal Fair Housing Act, they have factors that the ALJ or Commissioners are supposed to look at when deciding whether a civil penalty is appropriate, and to what extent.

So, we're going to be incorporating those factors into our Administrative Code, but the rulemaking process is a lengthy process, so we're going to be initiating that here in the next couple of months, because it can take anywhere from nine months up to a year.

And then as far as a few metrics go, we just completed Quarter 1 at the end of March. Our calls compared to 2023 are up a little bit, by about just a hundred calls, about 2400 versus 2300 last year. Our inquiries are down just a little bit, 599 compared to 649 .

Our formalized complaints, we've not had nearly as many as we did at this point last year. Last year we had 327 through the end of March. This year we are only sitting at 208. However, our closures have gone up quite a bit. Through the end of March in 2023 we're at 138 , versus 194 closures so far in the first three months of 2024 .

And then as of the end of March, we had 51 open cases for litigation purposes in either the administrative or state court setting, and through the first three months we had closed 17 litigation cases, either due to settlement or being decided on the merits.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I'd like to go back to the change that's effective July lst. MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Sure.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: You reference that beginning July lst, the ALJ will now be more of the administrative process. Do any of the appeals that are done, are -- they do not -- no longer come to the Civil Rights, or how is that?

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Appeals of what?

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: So, if the ALJ
makes a decision on the case and the respondent or complainant chooses to appeal, is --

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Are you talking about like a judicial review?

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Yes.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: So, cases that go up on judicial review, if they come back, then they'll go back to the ALJ. So -- and even - so, like even on cases that are currently going through now, if they go up on judicial review, and then if they come back, they'll go back to the ALJ as the ultimate authority.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay.
MR. FLEISCHHACKER: So, only cases that are currently before the Commission and then be -- come before the Commission between now and

June 30 th, the Commission would retain ultimate authority status for those cases, but once that July lst date hits, anything that is initiated after that or comes back on judicial review after that, it goes to the ALJ.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay.
MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Because I know like right now, we do have a case that's pending before the Indiana Sup -- or the Court of Appeals on judicial review, so if that comes back after July lst -- I doubt that it would, because it hasn't even been briefed yet, but coming back after July 1st, that would go to the Administrative Law Judge versus the Commission.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay. Thank you.
Are there any other questions for Deputy Director Fleischhacker.

COMM. HARRINGTON: The only question I have is --

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Sure.
COMM. HARRINGTON: -- when it comes back -- I know you pool the Administrative Law Judges. Will it go back to the same person --

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: That would be
for - -

COMM. HARRINGTON: -- that initially --

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Potentially, yes. It would be for the Office of Administrative Law Proceedings to determine, because if that person isn't there anymore, then obviously it couldn't go back to them, but they have processes in place to make sure that the appropriate ALJ's are hearing appropriate cases within their jurisdiction. They do a lot of ALJ services for a number of different agencies --

COMM. HARRINGTON: Uh-huh.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: $\quad-\quad$ FSSA being their largest one, so they have ALJ's that are kind of --

COMM. HARRINGTON: Well, I thought it would be better --

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: -- topic specific.

COMM. HARRINGTON: -- if a different one saw it so you'd have another perspective, and

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: That'll be up to
them. So -- and it'll depend on why it comes back, because like the case that's up on for the Court of Appeals right now was decided on summary judgment, so if it comes back, then it would likely go to an evidentiary hearing, but the original ALJ's that -- one of them is no longer a state employee, the other one's still at OALP. So, it's up to them to decide which ALJ is assigned that.

COMM. HARRINGTON: And what is the driver or benefit for changing the process?

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: It's my
understanding that the idea behind it was to make the administrative process easier and quicker instead of adding additional review periods for a case, because right now, if an ALJ is the -- not an ultimate authority, then you can file objections to that within 15 days of that ALJ nonfinal order, then that goes to the ultimate authority, then 30 days to brief after that objection period, and then the -- then there's an
oral argument before that ultimate authority, and then they have 90 days, versus initiating that process more quickly and getting through it.

There's still -- they added in a process where you can file a motion to correct errors from the ALJ order as the ultimate authority, so there's still a process for us to try to correct things if we find something in the order that should be corrected. We can still file that and have that go through that process. So, that kind of objection right is still within there, not as robust, $I$ think, as it is currently, but that was, you know, what the General Assembly decided in how they wanted administrative proceedings to be.

COMM. HARRINGTON: Okay. And I would just ask, as we're moving forward, just if there could be training to clarify so everybody understands, because like I say, I hear what's going to be different, but $I$ still don't understand the value and the process, and it's easier for whom? Is it the individuals providing the complaint, or is it a process improvement

```
internally? So, I still don't quite understand
it, even --
```

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Sure.
COMM. HARRINGTON: -- from the description that you gave. So, I just want to make sure --

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: It'll be less work -- it'll be less work for the Commission, for you guys.

COMM. HARRINGTON: But less work doesn't always mean it's in the best interest, and that -- I didn't hear that in this.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Sure.
COMM. HARRINGTON: So, I'm just trying to understand.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: And that's my comment as well, is we're here for a purpose and reason, and we want to make sure that everybody has the opportunity for fair and equal justice.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Sure.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Thank you.
Any other questions from Commissioners? (No response.)

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Thank you, Deputy
Director.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: You're welcome.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Item $V$ is Old
Business, and we have the Commissioners that have been appointed. The next case that we have for review and recommendation is Cary Lynch versus New Albany Housing Authority, Case No. HOra23090724, and this was assigned to Comm. Tolliver.

Do you have a recommendation?
COMM. TOLLIVER: There were two issues here, no reasonable cause -- is this not an oral argument?

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: It's not listed as having an oral argument.

MR. LOSTUTTER: The first case, no, it is not an oral argument.

COMM. TOLLIVER: Okay. So, the first issue, there was no reasonable cause under the Indiana Fair Housing Act and no probable cause under the Indiana Civil Rights Law, and for the second issue, we're just saying no -- I'd ask

```
that we accept the Commission's finding of no
reasonable cause under the Indiana Fair Housing
Act and no probable cause under the Indiana Civil
Rights law.
```

    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a motion to
    approve.

COMM. JACKSON: So moved.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Second.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: It's seconded.
MR. LOSTUTTER: We will go ahead and
call the roll.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Yeah. All those
in favor --
MR. LOSTUTTER: Yeah.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: All those in
favor, signify by saying aye.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.
COMM. JACKSON: Aye.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries.

The next case is Joseph Maher versus

Charlestowne LLC \& Freeman Development

Corporation, Case No. HOse23080674. That case was assigned to me, and we have reference for oral arguments. I believe we have at least the Respondent on the phone.

MR. WILEY: Correct. This is Craig
Wiley.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Do we have the Complainant as well?

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: We do not.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay.
So, the process for the oral argument is we normally give each party five minutes of opportunity to express their concerns or issues, and then we would also provide a minute of rebuttal, or two, if needed. Since there's -the Complainant is not on, $I$ will allow the representative for the Respondent to plead their case. So, I will give you five minutes.


So, the -- the Respondent had to evict Mr. Maher, and the reasons are well documented in the position statement. He had engaged in behaviors that caused fear in the community, especially among the female tenants, and those are set forth in witness statements, again, in the position statements.

The -- Charlestowne did an investigation based on the witness statements and the allegations made against Mr. Maher, including conducting an interview of him and hearing his side of the story, and they made a decision on August lst to evict him.

Fifteen days later, the property manager received an e-mail from Mr. Maher saying that he had -- he suffers from $O C D$ and anxiety and he had a fear of dogs, and he wanted the property to leash dogs, have leashed dogs, which is already their policy, and that he remain on the property.

Then later that day, the community
received another e-mail from a -- from a patient advocate from St. Vincent, again stating that he

1
was undergoing outpatient treatment for oCD, and that he had a fear of dogs, leashed and unleashed, and that -- again, that he wanted to remain on the property. And the -- it was something that they -- they just simply could not accommodate his behaviors. So, eventually he was -- he moved out and vacated the property. So, essentially this case is based on two issues: You know, whether he was denied a reasonable accommodation, and whether he was subjected to sex discrimination.

As to the reasonable accommodation claim,
you know, as far as leashed dogs, that's their policy, and he signed that he knew that, he signed as part of the lease to have the requirement that tenants have their dogs on a leash. So, they are already doing that.

As far as his fear of dogs, when he -- he signed a -- again, on the lease it said that it was a pet-friendly environment, so that was something they -- his fear of dogs was something they could not accommodate.

As far as his behaviors, again, you
know -- and they're well documented in the position statement -- again, that's something that they simply could not accommodate because of the fear it caused in the community among the female tenants.

MR. LOSTUTTER: One minute.

MR. WILEY: Several -- go ahead; I'm sorry.

MR. LOSTUTTER: There's one minute left.

MR. WILEY: One minute? Okay. Thank you. Sure.

So, again, his behaviors was something they simply could not accommodate and, in fact, it placed them in legal jeopardy if the property did not take some sort of action, which they did.

As far as the sex discrimination, the basis is, is that the individuals who filed the complaints were all females. That's -- that's simply not a basis to show that he was subjected to sex discrimination.

So, in essence, the question before the Commission would be what would -- what was the
property supposed to do? They had to take some sort of action, and in fact, $I$ think it's even in one of the statements that the fear he caused with one of the female tenants, she asked to be released from her lease, and the property did have --

MR. LOSTUTTER: Time.
MR. WILEY: There's also some police reports, so --

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Thank you.
MR. WILEY: -- so, in essence, that's the -- thank you.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: The Complainant is -- again, is not present --

MR. LOSTUTTER: Not present.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: -- on the phone or in person, and each of us have had an opportunity to review this case. It is my recommendation, since it was assigned me, on all three issues, to uphold the Deputy Director's finding of no reasonable cause under the Indiana Fair Housing Act, and no probable cause under the Indiana Civil Rights Law.

| 1 | We need a motion to approve. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | COMM. HARRINGTON: So moved. |
| 3 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: We need a second. |
| 4 | COMM. SILBERBERG: Second. |
| 5 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: And we need to |
| 6 | vote on this. |
| 7 | MR. LOStutter: Yes. |
| 8 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: All those in favor |
| 9 | of the motion, please signify by saying aye. |
| 10 | COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye. |
| 11 | COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye. |
| 12 | COMM. JACKSON: Aye. |
| 13 | COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye. |
| 14 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye. |
| 15 | Are there any opposed? |
| 16 | (No response.) |
| 17 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions? |
| 18 | (No response.) |
| 19 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries. |
| 20 | Thank you, Mr. Wiley. |
| 21 | The next case is Ashleigh Foster versus |
| 22 | Hamilton National Title, LLC doing business as |
| 23 | Near North Title. That's Case No. EMra23100624, |

and this was assigned to Comm. Slash, and we will continue this case in May.

Any questions on that?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: The next case is

Gary McElfresh versus Centennial of Cedar Lake Townhomes Association, Inc. That's Case No. HOre23110909, and that was assigned to Comm. Silberberg.

COMM. SILBERBERG: Yes. I would uphold no reasonable cause finding under the Fair Housing Act and no probable cause under Indiana Civil Rights Law.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Thank you.

I need a motion to approve.
COMM. JACKSON: So moved.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a second.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Second.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Second. Sorry for the interruption here. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.

COMM. JACKSON: Aye.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries.
The next case is Carly Vanarsdall versus
LD 303 Associates, LLP, Van Rooy Properties \& The Washington. It's Case No. HOha23110912. That was assigned to Comm. Tolliver.

COMM. TOLLIVER: Yes. There were two issues here, and I'd recommend we accept the Commission's findings of no reasonable cause under Indiana's Fair Housing Act and no probable cause under the Indiana Civil Rights Law for both of them.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Thank you,
Commissioner.
I need a motion to approve.
COMM. HARRINGTON: So moved.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a second.

| 1 | COMM. SILBERBERG: Second. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Second. All those |
| 3 | in favor, please signify by saying aye. |
| 4 | COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye. |
| 5 | COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye. |
| 6 | COMM. JACKSON: Aye. |
| 7 | COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye. |
| 8 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye. |
| 9 | Any opposed? |
| 10 | (No response.) |
| 11 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries. |
| 14 | The next case, Jeffrey House versus G. W. |
| 15 | Berkheimer Company, Inc., Case No. EMha23030248, |
| 16 | and that was assigned to Comm. Harrington. |
| 17 | COMM. HARRINGTON: Yes. In this case |
| 18 | I would recommend that we uphold the no probable |
| 19 | finding under Indiana Civil Rights Law. |
| 20 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a motion to |
| 21 | approve. |
| 22 | COMM. SILBERBERG: So moved. |
| 23 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a second. |


| 1 | COMM. TOLLIVER: Second. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: All those in |
| 3 | favor, signify by saying aye. |
| 4 | COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye. |
| 5 | COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye. |
| 6 | COMM. JACKSON: Aye. |
| 7 | COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye. |
| 8 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye. |
| 9 | Any opposed? |
| 10 | (No response.) |
| 11 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries. |
| 14 | The next case is Toriann Alvarado versus |
| 15 | Hoosier Staffers, Inc., Case No. EMra22080471, |
| 16 | and this is scheduled for oral arguments as well. |
| 17 | MR. LOSTUTTER: Yes. |
| 18 | VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Do we have |
| 19 | either -- |
| 20 | MR. LOSTUTTER: We have a |
| 21 | representative for the Respondent. |
| 22 | MR. BARCHET: Yes. |
| 23 | MR. LOStutter: And -- but we do not |

have the Complainant, either in person or on the line.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay.
Would you please identify yourself?
MR. BARCHET: Yes. My name is Andrew
Barchet. I'm an attorney representing Hoosier Staffers.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay. I don't know if you heard our previous dialogue, but we'll give you five minutes to plead your position, and since we do not have -- or at least do not have the Complainant yet, we will listen to your arguments and make a decision.

MR. BARCHET: Thank you, Vice-Chair Ramos, and thank you, Commissioners, for the opportunity to be heard today.

I'll keep it brief. Ms. Alvarado filed her Equal Opportunity -- or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission violation against Hoosier Staffers on June 13 of 2022 . It was then transferred to the Commission for investigation, and the Indiana Civil Rights Commission issued its findings on February 19th of 2024, already
stating that they found no comments that
Ms. Alvarado had alleged against her were severe
and pervasive enough or had to do at all with her race.

Hoosier Staffers, while technically her employer, was a hiring agency that shipped her -send her to different locations. She faced the alleged comments at these different locations. Hoosier Staffers still took the time to make sure, pull her from those less-than-ideal environments, and place her to another facility where she could still enjoy employment.

The Commission found that they immediately took corrective action, and that Hoosier Staffers was not in charge of supervising or directing Ms. Alvarado or any of the alleged speakers of such comments.

And so, for Ms. Alvarado to win on her complaint, she would have to show that she was subjected to unwelcome comments or actions that related to her race or her gender that were severe or pervasive, she made known they were unwelcome, and Respondent failed to take

```
corrective action, and she was failed to
resign -- or she was forced to resign as a
result.
```

And as we described here, the Commission found that they were not severe or pervasive enough to warrant the discrimination that she's alleging, and Hoosier Staffers immediately took the steps necessary to correct this situation, and she was not forced to resign as a result. She was able to maintain employment working at other facilities. So, we just ask that you find in line with the Civil Rights Commission Deputy Director.

Thank you very much.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Are there any
questions for him?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay. I have reviewed this case, and it is my recommendation that we uphold the Deputy Director's finding of no probable cause under the Indiana Civil Rights Law. If there would be a motion, I'd appreciate that.

```
    COMM. JACKSON: So moved.
    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a second.
    COMM. TOLLIVER: Second.
    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: All those in
favor, signify by saying aye.
    COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.
COMM. JACKSON: Aye.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.
Any opposed?
    (No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions?
    (No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries.
Thank you, Mr. Barchet.
MR. BARCHET: Thank you,
Commissioners.
    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: The next case is
Vicky Newman versus Tenneco Automotive Operating
Company, Inc. The Case Number is EMha23070622,
and this was assigned to Chair Slash, and since
she's not here, we will continue this case in
```

May.
That's all of the Old Business. We'll move on to New Business, and there are three cases to assign. The first case is Paula Lydia

Castillo versus the Indiana Department of Correction, Case No. EMno23100774, and I will assign that case to me.

The next case is Constance Kalb versus AAM Professional Services Vandalia By Del Web Homeowners' Association, Inc. \& Associated Asset Management LLC. The Case Number is Hoha23110913. I'll assign that to Comm. Harrington.

The next case is Marckennedy Fils-Aime versus Covanta Energy, LLC doing business as Covanta Indianapolis, Inc. The Case Number is EMno23100789. They're also requesting oral arguments, and $I$ will assign that to Comm. Tolliver.
Any questions on any of that? (No response.)

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: That takes us to the next portion, which are Motions and Filings. There are none. And then it's review of ALJ

Decisions and Orders. This is the Administrative Law Judge's disposing of proceedings that become -- proceedings that become order -- a final order when affirmed under the Indiana Civil Rights Law, 4-21.5-3-21 -- 29; I'm sorry -- and Indiana Code 4-21.5-3-27(a). We do have to have votes required.

This is Shanita Redd, and on behalf of Minor Child M.R. versus Parkview Behavioral Health. The Case Number is PAra21080238, and this was submitted to the Commission on March 4 th.

On April 28th, '23, the Complainant, by private counsel, filed a complaint against the Respondent and others in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Case No. 1.23-CV-00179, based on the same issues before the Indiana Civil Rights Commission in Complainant's August 21 st complaint.

Complainant, by the Indiana Civil Rights Commission Staff Attorney Fred Bremer, moved to dismiss the complaint filed in this matter, as

Indiana Code Section 22-9-1-6 -- I believe that's a (q) -- states that the minute the complaint becomes the subject of an action in federal court, all actions shall immediately cease.

The ALJ grants the Complainant's motion and dismisses the complaint with prejudice, 90 -I'm sorry -- 910 IAC 1-3-6. The objection period in this matter has closed, but we do need a motion; correct?

MR. LOSTUTTER: Yes.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: We need a motion to approve -- I need a motion to approve the recommendations from the ALJ.

COMM. JACKSON: So moved.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a second.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Second.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: All those in
favor, signify by saying aye.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.
COMM. JACKSON: Aye.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.

Any opposed?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: The motion
carries.
The next item on the agenda is
ICRC/Samantha Knapp versus B \& Z Rentals, Case No. HOrt22020035, submitted to the Commission on March 8th, 2024.

The Administrative Law Judge in this matter has determined that the Complainant has failed to meet the burden of proof, and thus has ruled against her and in favor of the Respondent, dismissing her complaint and the IR -- ICRC Director's charge, with prejudice. The objection period in this matter has closed.

We need a motion on this?
MR. LOSTUTTER: Yes.
MR. FLEISCHHACKER: (Nodded yes.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: We do? Yeah.
All right. I need a motion to approve the recommendation.

COMM. TOLLIVER: So moved.
MR. FLEISCHHACKER: You're affirming
the ALJ order.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Affirming the
ALJ's recommendation.
COMM. TOLLIVER: So moved.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a second.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Second.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: All those in
favor, signify by saying aye.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.
COMM. JACKSON: Aye.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.
Any opposed?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries.
Item III is ICRC/Brian Spencer versus the
City of Greenburg, Case No. HOha22070370,
submitted to the Commission on February $23 r d$,

2024 .
The Administrative Law Judge in this
matter has determined that the Respondent is entitled to their Motion for a Summary Judgment, and that their designated evidence shows that the complainant -- the complaint of the Complainant has no genuine issue of material fact and is dismissed, with the Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment is granted. The objection period in this matter has closed.

I need a motion to affirm the ALJ's recommendation.

COMM. JACKSON: So moved.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I need a second.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Second.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: All those in
favor, signify by saying aye.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.
COMM. JACKSON: Aye.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.
(No response.)

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any abstentions?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries.
Section d., ALJ's Decisions Automatically

Confirmed, automatically confirmed under the Commission's Order of automatic -- on automatic adoption and approval of certain nonfinal decisions. No vote is required. And this is the case of Courtney Mallory versus Spherion Staffing, LLC, Case No. EMse23010067, and that was submitted to the Commission on April lst - 4th, 2024 .

Okay. The next item is meetings for 2024 . Our next meeting is on May 20th. May 20th, I'm -- are there any concerns that anyone has on the 20th?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: I have to look at my calendar real quick.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: And we were thinking -- typically April is our training month meeting. We're going to do that -- looking at

```
doing that in May, so we would have the
Commissioners arrive an hour early, so starting
at noon, lunch would be provided, and we'd take
that hour in Executive Session to do training,
talk about House Bill 1003, and other things.
We're going to use that as our annual training
time, so --
                    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Are there any
conflicts on anyone's schedule for the 20th?
    COMM. SILBERBERG: I may not be -- I
may not be able to be in person for that one.
MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Okay.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Would that be --
can I do remote, or --
                                    MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Yeah, absolutely,
yes.
                                    COMM. SILBERBERG: Okay.
                                    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any other
concerns, Commissioners?
                                    (No response.)
                                    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay. And are
there -- is the HUD Conference in June, on
the 17th?
```

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: No.

VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay. There are no other items connected with June? Because I know the summertime gets really busy.

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Not that I'm aware of at this point. I know later that week Summer Celebration starts, but that's not until the 20th, but we would not -- our conference for 2024 has not been confirmed yet for any particular date, but it's likely going to be later in the fall.

## VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay.

All right. So, we should be set for the $20 t h$, and then we'll look at the calendar for the rest of that. Item VIII on the agenda is Election and Training. Well, we'll review the election process.

Indiana Code 22-9-1-5. The Indiana Civil Rights Commission appoints members and meetings. Section 5 of this reviews that at the first meeting or each annual meeting, which is in April, and thereafter, the Commission shall organize by the election of a Chairman and a

1

2

Vice-Chairman for the membership, each of whom, except these first -- with the exception of those first elected, shall serve for a term of one year and until -- or until his succession is elected. The Commission shall hold one meeting a month, of course, and the April meeting is that meeting. So, we have to vote for Chair and for Vice-Chair. I have received communications from Chair Slash that she was happy to serve in any capacity that the Commission so chooses, and as the Vice-Chair, $I$ also am willing to serve in any capacity that -- it's been an honor for me, and I know Chair Slash, and for each of us. So, at this point, $I$ will entertain any motions. If more than one person is nominated, then we'll provide an opportunity for each to have two minutes to discuss why they want to serve in each capacity. At this point, I'm open for nominations.

COMM. HARRINGTON: I can make a motion that we continue with Chair Slash as President and Ramos as Vice-President, as it was the last time we voted. The value of both of

```
them and the knowledge that they bring -- I know
you've served for a while, Adrianne has as well
recently, but not as long, so we have a history,
unless there's an interest of anyone else
present.
    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Any comments or
```

questions?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Her
recommendation -- we'll do each of these
individually, so the recommendation is for Chair
Slash to continue her role as Chair. I need a
second on that motion.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Second.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Second by
Silberberg. All those in favor, signify by
saying aye.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Aye.
COMM. HARRINGTON: Aye.
COMM. JACKSON: Aye.
COMM. TOLLIVER: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Aye.
Any opposed?


VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Motion carries.
Okay. Back to the agenda. Are there any announcements?

MR. FLEISCHHACKER: Vice-Chair Ramos, I do have an "Other"; it's not really an announcement. Under the Commission's Administrative Code, if a matter has been set for a hearing, then the Commission needs to provide written consent for a complaint to be withdrawn against a respondent if it's been set for a hearing.

We do have a situation where we have a hearing that's scheduled for later this week, and there are two Respondents in the matter, and we've recently come to agreement terms with one of the Respondents, but in order for the complaint to get withdrawn against -- or against them, the Commission needs to consent to that.

So, Fred's working on a document for you guys to sign, so $I$ just wanted to let you guys - let it be known to you it's not something that needs to be done in official business during the Commission meeting, but if we could maybe hang

```
out for just a couple of minutes while he's
putting that together, we would appreciate that.
                    VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Okay. Thank you.
```

                    I know on behalf of Chair Slash and
    myself, we both thank you for the vote of
confidence in each of our roles. We enjoy the
capacity as well as serving with each of you.
Are there any other announcements?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Are there any
public comments?
(No response.)
VICE-CHAIR RAMOS: Hearing none, I
move to adjourn the meeting. It is 1:57.
Thank you all. I appreciate it.
COMM. SILBERBERG: Thank you.
Thereupon, the proceedings of
April 15, 2024 were concluded
at 1:57 o'clock p.m.
- - -
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| 21：8，23：18，24：21 | 32：10，32：13，32：15， |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { community }[5]-5: 17 \text {, } \\ & 6: 7,20: 5,20: 21, \\ & 22: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 24：23，25：2，25：5， | 33：21，35：1 | 4：12，24：13，25：10， |  |  |
| 5：7，26：9，26：11 | 35：15，35：17，35：23 | ：16，25：18， $25: 2$ | Community ${ }_{[1]}-6: 5$Company $[1]-32: 21$ |  |
| 7：14，27：15， 27 |  |  |  |  |
| :14, 28:15, 31:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 4,37: 7,37: 9 \\ & 37: 15,37: 18,37: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $26: 13,26: 22,27:$ | company［1］－27：15 compared［2］－9：3， |  |
| 速，33：6，33：7 | 38：14，38：16，38：22， | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 5,27: 6, \\ & 7: 17,27: 22^{2} \end{aligned}$ | ```9:6 complainant [4] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { date }[2]-11: 3,41: 10 \\ & \text { David }[1]-2: 7 \\ & \text { days }[4]-13: 20, \\ & 13: 22,14: 2,20: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3：8，33：11，33：1 | 39：2，39：4，39：19， |  |  |  |
| 3：15，34：17，37：22， | ：18 |  | 0：9，18：21，23：13 |  |
| 39 |  |  | 38：6 |  |
| Case［4］－18：6，34：10， $36.8,39: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:9, 43:15, 43:22, } \\ & \text { 44:2, 44:4, 44:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $32: 8,32: 9,35: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Complainant }[7] \text { - } \\ & \text { 18:13, 29:1, 29:12, } \end{aligned}$ | deal［1］－7：20 <br> decide［1］－13：10 |
| 36：8，39：11 <br> cases［15］－7：7 | 44：2，44：4，44：10， <br> $44: 13,44: 19,44 \cdot 22$ | $35: 16,35: 19,35: 20$ | 34：13，34：21，36：12， |  |
| 7：12，7：13，7：17，8：3， |  |  | 38.6 | decided［3］－9：20， |
| 9：16，9：19，10：13， | Chairman［2］－41：23， | 37：12，37：13，37：14， 38：13，38：15，38：18， | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Complainant's }[1] \text { - } \\ & 34: 19 \end{aligned}$ | deciding ${ }_{[1]}-8: 16$ <br> decision［4］－3：16， |
| 10：16，10：21，11：2， |  |  |  |  |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { HUD }_{[1]}-40: 22 \\ & \text { hundred }[1]-9: 4 \end{aligned}$ | ```invitations [1] - 5:23 invited [1] - 5:22 IR \({ }_{[1]}\) - 36:15 issue [5]-8:2, 16:20, 16:23, 19:18, \(38: 7\) issued [1]-29:22 issues [7] - 16:13, 18:18, 19:16, 21:9, 23:19, 26:14, 34:18 it'll [3]-13:3, 15:7, 15:8 item [6] - 4:1, 16:4, 36:7, 37:21, 39:14, 41:15 items [1]-41:3``` | 45:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:6, 22:9, 23:7, } \\ & \text { 23:15, 24:7, 28:17, } \\ & \text { 28:20, 28:23, } 35: 10, \\ & 36: 19 \\ & \text { lunch }[1]-40: 3 \\ & \text { Lydia }[1]-33: 4 \\ & \text { Lynch }[1]-16: 7 \end{aligned}$ | ```46:1 moderating [1] - 5:14 Monday [2] - 1:16, 47:7 monitor [1] - 19:1``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | lake [1] - 25:6 |  |  |
| IAC ${ }_{[1]}$ - 35:7 |  | language [1]-8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { month }[7]-3: 12,3: 14, \\ & 5: 11,5: 12,6: 3, \\ & 39: 22,42: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| ICRC [2] - 3:9, 36:15 ICRC/Brian [1] - 37:21 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { largest }[1]-12: 16 \\ & \text { last }[6]-3: 12,7: 18 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 36:8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Iaw [15] - 7:4, 7:10, } \\ & 7: 20,11: 14,11: 22, \end{aligned}$ |  | - |
|  |  |  | M.R [1] - 34:9 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { idea }[1]-13: 15 \\ & \text { ideal }[1]-30: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:22, 17:4, 23:23, } \\ & 25: 13,27: 19,31: 22, \end{aligned}$ | Maher [4]-18:4, 20:3, | 23, 9:13, 9:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ideal }[1]-30: 10 \\ & \text { identify }[1]-29: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 2:11, 20:16 | motion [34]-4:2 |
| III [1] - 37:21 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:13, 27:19, 31:22, } \\ & 34: 2,34: 5,36: 11, \end{aligned}$ | Maher's [1] - 19:10 | 4:13, $5: 5,14: 5,17$ |
| immediately [3] 30:13, 31:7, 35:4 |  | 38:2 | mail [2] - 20:16, 20:22 | 24:1, 24:9, |
|  |  | Law [2]-12:6, 26:17 | aintain [1] - 31: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:19, 25:15, 26:8, } \\ & \text { 26:21, 27:13, 27:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 30:13, 31:7, 35:4 improvement [1] - |  | LD [1] - 26:10 <br> lease [3] - 21:15, | Mallory [1] - 39:10 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Inc }[6]-25: 7,27: 15, \\ & 28: 15,32: 21,33: 10 \\ & 33: 15 \end{aligned}$ | Jackson [1] - 2:4 JACKSON [17] - 4:23, 17:7, 17:19, 24:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 19,23: 5 \\ & \text { leash }[2]-20: 19, \\ & 21: 17 \end{aligned}$ | management [1] - 33:11 | 28:13, 31:22, 32:15, $35: 5,35: 9,35: 11,$ |
|  |  |  | March [6]-9:2, 9:9, | 35:12, 36:5, 36:18, <br> 36:22, 37:20, 38:4, |
| 33:15 <br> including ${ }_{[1]}-20: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:16, 26:1, 27:6, } \\ & \text { 28:6, 32:1, 32:8, } \end{aligned}$ | leashed [3] - 20:19,$21: 2,21: 13$ | 9:12, 9:15, 34:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 8,38: 11,39: 4, \\ & 42: 21,43: 13,44: 4, \\ & 44: 11,45: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| incorporating ${ }_{[1]}$ -8:18 |  |  | 36:10Marckennedy [1] - |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 13,38: 20,43: 20, \\ & 44: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:2, 21:13 } \\ & \text { least }[2]-18: 8,29: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INDIANA [3] - 1:1, } \\ & 1: 21,2: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { least }[2]-18: 8,29: 11 \\ & \text { left }[1]-22: 10 \end{aligned}$ | Marckennedy [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { motions [2] - 33:22, } \\ & 42: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | legal [1]-22:15 | material [1] - 38:7 |  |
| 1:21,2:6 - 10 | James [1] - 2:4 <br> Jeffrey [1] - 27:14 | legislative-related ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { matter }[11]-1: 10, \\ 3: 20,34: 23,35: 8, \end{gathered}$ | move [2] - 33:3, 46:14 moved [13]-4:4, 17:7, |
| 1:14, 1:16, 1:22, 2:8, |  |  |  |  |
| 2:9, 5:6, 5:17, 6:15, $6: 18,119,16: 21$, | Jeffrey [1]-27:14 <br> jeopardy [1] - 22:15 | $\begin{aligned} & -6: 23 \\ & \text { lenathy }[1]-8: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 36:12, 36:17, 38:3, | 21:7, 24:2, 25:16, |
| 6:18, 11:9, 16:21, $16: 22,17: 2,17: 3$, | joining [1] - 5:19 Joseph $[1]$ - 18:4 | lengthy $[1]-8: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 10,45: 7,45: 14 \\ & 47: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 22,27: 22,32: 1, \\ & 34: 22,35: 14,37: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23:21, 23:22, 25:12, | Jr [3]-1:13, 47:2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { less }[4]-15: 7,15: 8, \\ 15: 10,30: 10 \end{gathered}$ | matters [1] - 5:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 22,35: 14,37: 1, \\ & 37: 6,38: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 26:17, 27:19, 29:22, | 47:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { less-than-ideal }[1] \text { - } \\ & 30: 10 \end{aligned}$ | McElfresh [1]-25:6 mean [1]-15:11 | moving [1] - 14:17 <br> MR [60] - 3:7, 4:5, 5:8, |
| 31:21, 33:5, 34:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { judge }[4]-7: 11, \\ & 11: 14,36: 11,38: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 34:6, 34:17, 34:18, |  | level $[1]-8: 13$ <br> libraries [1] - 6:7 <br> likely [2] - 13:7, 41:10 | meet $[1]$ - 36:13 | MR [60]-3:7, 4:5, 5:8, 6:19, 6:21, 9:23, |
| 34:21, 35:1, 41:18, | judge's [1] - 34:2 |  | MEETING [1]-1:5 <br> meeting [12] - 3:5, 3:9, | 10:6, 10:10, 10:13, |
| 47:4, 47:13 | judges [1] - 11:23 |  |  | 10:21, 11:7, 11:20, |
| Indiana's [1]-26:16 | Judgment [1] - 38:9 judgment [2] - 13:6, | Lindy [3] - 1:12, 47:2, | 3:18, 39:15, 39:23, | 12:1, 12:5, 12:15, |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Indianapolis [3] - } \\ 1: 16,2: 9,33: 15 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 11 \\ & \text { line }[3]-4: 18,29: 2, \\ & 31: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 21,42: 5,42: 6 \\ & 42: 7,45: 23,46: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 20,13: 2,13: 14, \\ & 15: 3,15: 7,15: 13 \\ & 15: 20,16: 3,16: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | judgment $[2]-13: 6$, |  |  |  |
| individual [1] - 6:12 | judicial [5] - 10:11, |  | meetings [2] - 39:14, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { individually }[1] \text { - } \\ & 43: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 14,10: 17,11: 4 \\ & 11: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 31:12 listed ${ }_{[1]}-16: 15$ | 41:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:20, 16:3, 16:17, } \\ & \text { 17:10, 17:14, 18:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | listen [1] - 29:12 | Melissa [1] - 5:15 <br> members [1]-41:19 | 18:14, 19:3, 19:6, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { individuals }[2]- \\ 14: 22,22: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { July }[8]-7: 6,7: 7, \\ & 7: 10,9: 22,10: 2, \\ & 11: 3,11: 11,11: 13 \end{aligned}$ | listening [1] - 3:11 <br> litigation [2]-9:16, |  | 19:23, 22:6, 22:7, |
|  |  |  | MEMBERS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:2 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { initiated }[4]-7: 7, \\ 7: 10,7: 15,11: 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:9, 22:11, 23:7, } \\ & \text { 23:8, 23:11, 23:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 11: 3,11: 11,11: 13 \\ \text { June }[5]-7: 15,11: 1, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LLC }_{[6]}-1: 21,18: 5 \\ & 24: 22,33: 11,33: 14, \\ & 39: 11 \end{aligned}$ | membership [1]-42:1 <br> mental $[1]-5: 19$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { initiating }[2]-8: 21, \\ & 14: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:20, } 40: 22,41: 3 \\ & \text { jurisdiction }[1]-12: 12 \\ & \text { justice }[1]-15: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | merits [1] - 9:20 <br> metrics [1]-9:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 7,28: 17,28: 20, \\ & 28: 22,28: 23,29: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| inquiries [1]-9:5 instead [1]-13:17 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LLP }_{[1]}-26: 10 \\ & \text { local }[1]-6: 7 \\ & \text { locations }[2]-30: 7 \text {, } \\ & \quad 30: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Meyer }[3]-1: 12,47: 2, \\ & 47: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:14, 32:17, 35:10, } \\ & 36: 19,36: 20,37: 2, \\ & 39: 21,40: 12,40: 15, \\ & 41: 1,41: 5,45: 4 \\ & \text { mute }[1]-6: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| intake [1] - 6:9 <br> interest [2]-15:11, $43: 4$ | K |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Michael [2]-2:12, 19:1 <br> minor [1]-34:9 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Kalb }_{[1]}-33: 8 \\ & \text { keep }_{[1]}-29: 17 \\ & \text { kind }_{[2]}-12: 17,14: 10 \\ & \text { Kirchoff }_{[1]}-2: 13 \\ & \text { Knapp }_{[1]}-36: 8 \\ & \text { knowledge }_{[1]}-43: 1 \\ & \text { known }_{[2]}-30: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { look }[4]-8: 10,8: 15, \\ 39: 19,41: 14 \\ \text { looking }[1]-39: 23 \\ \text { Lostutter }[1]-2: 12 \\ \text { LOSTUTTER }[16]- \\ 3: 7,6: 19,16: 17, \\ \text { 17:10, 17:14, 19:3, } \end{gathered}$ | ```minor [1] - 34:9 minute [5]-18:19, 22:6, 22:9, 22:11, 35:2 minutes [9]-3:9, 4:2, 4:3, 4:12, 18:17, 18:23, 29:10, 42:17,``` |  |
| internally [1] - 15:1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { interruption }[1] \text { - } \\ & 25: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | N |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| interview [1]-20:12 |  |  |  | name [1] - 29:5 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { investigation [2] - } \\ 20: 9.29: 21 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | national [2] - 5:12, |





