MEMORANDUM

To:	Paul Valenti, Director, Pinellas County Office of Human Rights		
From:	Jason C. Ester, Senior Assistant County Attorney		
CC:	Mark Esparza, Senior Equal Opportunity Coordinator		
Date:	June 7, 2016		
Re:	Review of Final Investigative Report/Determination Case Name: Collins v. Golf Terrace investment Co., LP, et al. Case No.: 04-16-4202-8		
	wed the Final Investigative Repuman Rights in the above matte	oort/Determination issued by the Pinellas County r.	
The complai	nt alleged a violation (or violation	ons) of:	
☐ Chapter 7	Housing Act (42 U.S.C. §360170 of the Pinellas County Code of the Alleged discrimination based	• • • •	
-	•	31	
☐ Race ☐ Color	□ Sex	☐ Familial Status	
		☐ Sexual Orientation	
		der Identity/Expression	
☐ National		der identity/Expression	
Specifically,	the complaint alleged the follow	ring discriminatory act(s):	
☐ Refusing to rent or sell		□ "Steering"	
☐ Falsely denying availability of housing		☐ "Blockbusting "	
☐ Refusing to negotiate for housing		☐ Intimidation, interference or coercion	
☐ Discriminatory housing terms/conditions		☐ Lending Discrimination	
☐ Discriminatory advertising		☐ Denying a reasonable	
□ Other:		accommodation/modification	

I have determined that the housing opportunity which is the subject of the complaint is not exempt under the Fair Housing Act or Chapter 70 of the Pinellas County Code of Ordinances.

I have determined that the Final Investigative Report/Determination issued by the Pinellas County Office of Human Rights ⊠ does/□ does not establish direct evidence of discrimination.

In the absence of direct evidence of discrimination, case law provides that allegations of discrimination should be assessed by use of a "burden-shifting" analysis first adopted by the United States Supreme Court in <u>McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green</u>, 411 U.S. 792 (1973).

Proper use of this "burden-shifting" analysis requires the complainant(s) to first establish a prima facie case of discrimination. If the complainant establishes a prima facie case of discrimination, the burden then shifts to the respondent(s) to articulate a neutral and nondiscriminatory reason or reasons for their action(s). If respondent(s) articulate(s) a neutral and non-discriminatory reason or reasons for their action(s), the burden then shifts to complainant(s) to demonstrate that the articulated neutral and non-discriminatory reason is a pretext for discrimination¹.

I have determined that the Final Investigative Report/Determination issued by the Pinellas County Office of Human Rights does establish a prima facie case of discrimination.

Having determined the Final Investigative Report/Determination issued by the Pinellas County Office of Human Rights establishes a prima facie case of discrimination, the burden then shifts to respondent(s) to articulate a neutral and non-discriminatory reason or reasons for their act(s).

My review of the Final Investigative Report/Determination issued by the Pinellas County Office of Human Rights establishes the respondent(s) \square have/ \square have not articulated a neutral and non-discriminatory reason or reasons for their act(s).

Therefore, based on my review of the Final Investigative Report/Determination issued by the Pinellas County Office of Human Rights, I concur in the reasonable cause determination, and find there is a sufficient legal basis for establishing a violation of law.

¹ Texas Dept. Commun. Affairs v. Burdine, 450 U.S. 248 (1981), at 252, 253.