

DETERMINATION OF REASONABLE CAUSE

CASE NAME: Crystal Allen v 2001 Develop, LLC et al

CASE NUMBER: HUD NO.: 04-25-7674-8 PCOHR NO.: PC-25-006

I. JURISDICTION:

Complainant Crystal Allen (hereinafter “CP”) alleges that Respondents discriminated against her on the basis of disability by denying her a reasonable accommodation and subjected to different terms and conditions.

Respondent housing provider 2001 Develop LLC (“Respondent 2001”), and managed by The Grey Roosters, LLC. (“Respondent Roosters”). All named Respondents are not exempt under the applicable statutes.

The subject property is located at 2001 2nd Street S., St. Petersburg, FL 33705. The property in question is not exempt under the applicable statutes.

The most recent alleged discriminatory act occurred on November 4, 2024, and the complaint was timely filed on November 27, 2024. On March 25, 2025, the complaint was amended to include R Roosters as the management company.

If proven, the allegations would constitute a violation of Sections 804(f)(2) and 804(f)(3)(B) of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Act of 1988, and Chapter 70 of the Pinellas County Code of Ordinances. Section 804(f)(2) makes it unlawful to discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale or rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection with such dwelling, because of a handicap of, (A) that person; or (B) a person residing in or intending to reside in that dwelling after it is so sold, rented, or made available; and Section 804(f)(3)(B) states that a refusal to make reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services, when such accommodations may be necessary to afford such person equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.

Respondents do not receive federal funding.

II. COMPLAINANT’S ALLEGATIONS:

Complainant Crystal Allen (CP Allen) belongs to a class of persons whom the Fair Housing Act protects because she is involved in a protected activity. CP Allen was interested in renting a property located at 2001 2nd Street South St. Petersburg, FL 33705. The property is owned and managed by 2001 Develop LLC (RP 2001). She requested a reasonable accommodation for her service animal and her request was denied.

CP Allen was interested in renting the property located at 2001 2nd Street South St. Petersburg, FL 33705. On November 4, 2024, CP Allen scheduled an appointment to view the unit she was interested in renting. She met with a woman (Elce) who showed her the unit and offered to show another unit in the other side. After viewing the property CP Allen advised her, she was

interested in renting the unit and asked what she needed to do to move forward with the application process. The woman contacted a male over the phone and placed him on speakerphone. CP Allen asked questions regarding the properties, and she advised the gentleman (Nalla Nalla/Alex Silva) that she wanted to proceed. The gentleman asked if CP Allen had pets, and she stated she had a service animal, and all documentation required to be provided during the application process. CP Allen states the gentleman went over the application and advised her of the application fees, rent fee, pet deposit, and monthly fees. CP Allen advised the gentleman she had a service dog, not a pet. The gentleman advised her that he understood it was a service animal, but he still has to charge the pet fees and pet rent. At this point CP Allen states that the gentleman refused her accommodation, and she ended up not renting the unit.

III. RESPONDENTS' DEFENSES:

Respondent 2001 states that they have no records that CP submitted a rental application for the unit in question. Respondent states that while CP may have expressed interest in the unit during her visit, they have no documentation or records indicating that CP completed the application process or provided the required materials for further consideration.

Respondent 2001 states that based on discussions with their team, CP may have visited the property and viewed the available unit. However, they do not maintain a log of visitors, as it is not required for property tours, and it is challenging to confirm who visits unless an application is formally submitted. During property tours, their team doesn't discuss general rental policies that are addressed to our office staff.

Respondent 2001 states they adhere strictly to the Fair Housing Act and state laws regarding reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities, including those with service animals. Respondents' policy explicitly exempts service animals from pet fees and ensures that requests for reasonable accommodations are addressed promptly and in compliance with the law. Respondents state they currently have tenants in other properties who have service animals, and they have no issues or complaints in accommodating their needs.

Respondent 2001 stated the allegations do not align with their practices or policies. Without a formal application or specific documentation from CP, they had no opportunity to evaluate or act upon her request for a reasonable accommodation. If CP had submitted an application and accompanying documentation, they would have promptly reviewed it in accordance with their standard procedure. The claim that they refused CP's accommodation request is not accurate. At no point did Respondent formally deny CP's request because the process of submitting an application and verifying eligibility was never completed.

Respondent 2001 states that while they have no record of an application or formal denial of accommodations, they welcome CP to re-engage with them. Respondent encourages CP to visit their office to submit a rental application, provide the necessary documentation for her service animal, and allow them to properly review her application and ensure full compliance with housing laws.

Respondent 2001 stated that they uphold the FHA and ensure compliance with its provisions.

They Maintain clear and transparent policies regarding service animals and reasonable accommodations.

Regarding Respondent Rooster, they assert that they are committed to complying with Federal, State, and local laws in provision of housing and treats accusations of violation very seriously.

In regard to CP's claims that on November 4, 2024, she scheduled an appointment to view a unit she was interested in renting as [sic] 2001 2nd Street South St. Petersburg, FL 33705. Respondents have reviewed their records and have not been able to locate any records relating to CP's visit, but the unit was available and being shown by residents during that time period.

2001 Develop LLC is the owner of the property and The Grey Roosters, LLC manages the property and leases the units to tenants. Respondent Roosters manages properties for both short term rentals and long-term leases. Respondent Roosters markets its long-term rental properties on multiple platforms, including Zillow, Apartments.com, Furnished Finder, and Facebook to attract qualified tenants.

When a prospective tenant expresses interest, Respondent Roosters responds with an invitation to schedule a property tour, allowing them to view the unit before proceeding with an application. These tours are often conducted by one of the fellow tenants for the multi-family units. If the prospective tenant remains interested Respondent Roosters provides them with a link to an application. The rental application is processed by a third party called DoorLoop conducting a comprehensive tenant background check, including: Credit Score Report – Assessing financial responsibility and payment history. Eviction Report – Identifying any prior eviction records.

Respondent Rooster states that they understand that CP found the property via a Facebook post by Nalla Nalla. To note, Nalla Nalla's real name is Alex Silva. Respondent Rooster requested that Mr.Silva review his records to see whether he has any record of CPs request. In addition, Renan Yared and David Braun have reviewed their cell phones and Facebook messages and did not find any record there. The Ring camera footage for the property was also reviewed but any footage from that date had already been overwritten.

Furthermore, Respondent Rooster noted that according to CP she was shown the property by an unknown woman she asked what she needed to do to move forward with the application process. The woman who showed the property called an unidentified gentleman who allegedly informed her that she was going to have to pay a pet deposit and pet rent for her service animal.

It is these statements on which CP relies for her claims of discrimination in terms, conditions, or privileges relating to rental and failure to make reasonable accommodation. Respondent Roosters, however, has and continues to grant individuals accommodations to help with their disabilities. Respondent Roosters noted that, for example currently has 2 tenants with service animals one of whom resides at the same property that CP originally visited.

Unfortunately, neither CP nor Respondent Roosters knows who it is that CP spoke with over the phone that day. What we do know though is that CP never submitted an application for tenancy

at the property in question. Without an application, we had no opportunity to evaluate her eligibility, it is unknown whether she was qualified to rent the dwelling. Respondent Roosters asserts that they do not discriminate against individuals on the basis of any protected class status and takes these allegations extremely seriously.

IV. FINDINGS:

10/24	CP sent message on Facebook "FB" that she was interested in the subject apartment.
10/31/24	The representative going by "Nalla Nalla" responded to CP.
10/31/24 – 11/4/24	FB messages between CP and representative regarding scheduling a time for CP to view the apartment.
11/4/24	CP, with her service animal, met a female representative at the location at 1:00pm whom showed her the unit. During a conversation over the phone with an unknown man, CP was told that if she did not agree to pay the pet deposit and monthly fees, he would not rent to her after she informed him the dog was a service animal. CP then left without submitting an application based on this verbal denial.
11/25/24	Respondent's new tenant with a service animal signed a lease stating the tenant would pay a pet deposit for the tenant's known service animal.

V. ANALYSIS:

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION: DISABILITY

To establish a violation under the Act, the investigation must demonstrate that:

1. CP is a person with a disability.
2. Respondent knew or reasonably should have known that CP is a person with a disability.
3. CP requested an accommodation in the rules, policies, practices, or services of the respondent.
4. The requested accommodation may be necessary to afford CP an equal opportunity to use and enjoy the dwelling.
5. Respondent refused CP's request to make such accommodation or failed to respond or delayed responding to the request such that it amounted to a denial. and; as reflected in the McDonnell-Douglas framework subsection 804(f)(2):
6. The respondent's refusal made housing unavailable to CP.

As to element one, the CP submitted to the investigator a letter from K-9 Companions dog training which illustrates the CP the dog performs a task that "directly mitigates" the symptoms of the CP's disability. As such the CP provided sufficient evidence to PCOHR to establish that she is a person with a disability. The first element is met.

As to element two, when CP stated that she is a disabled Veteran and that she had a service animal, Respondents were put on notice that CP is a person with a disability.

As to element three, CP informed the gentleman she was speaking to during the visit that her dog was a service animal and was not required to pay a pet deposit or pet fee. The third element is met.

As to element four, CP provided sufficient evidence to PCOHR that she requires the use of her service animal, therefore the service animal is necessary to afford CP an equal opportunity to use and enjoy the dwelling. The fourth element is met.

As to element five, CP was told by the gentleman on the phone that she had to pay a pet deposit and monthly pet fee even after being told CP's dog is a service animal. The fifth element is met.

As to element six, CP was told by the gentleman on the phone that if she did not agree to pay the pet deposit and monthly pet fees for her service animal, he would not rent to her. As Such the CP left the property and did not submit an application. Notably, it is the RP's position they have no record of the CP visiting or knowledge of who may have interacted with her or told her about any fees. Yet, regarding the RP's defenses, the CP provided messages showing that she communicated on the day in question with the RP's and did interact with the respondent's contacts. Thus, the sixth element has been met.

To further illustrate the denial at element five, on or about October 31, 2024, CP found an advertisement for an apartment on Facebook marketplace. CP contacted Nalla Nalla, the name on the listing, (later identified by Respondents as Alex Silva) to say that she was interested in the unit. The messages between CP and Nalla Nalla scheduled a time to meet and view the unit for November 4, 2024, at 1:00 PM.

According to the CP, she arrived at the unit with her service animal. CP states that upon arrival a woman, (later identified by CP as Elce), showed her the unit. CP began asking questions and the woman kept saying that she did not know any information regarding the unit. CP stated that once she said that she was interested in renting the unit, the woman called a man on the phone, noting; initially speaking a foreign language. The woman later put the man on speakerphone, and he spoke to CP. CP stated that the man went over a few things with her about the unit and then asked if she had any pets, CP responded no that she had a service animal. The man on the phone then told her that she would have to pay a pet deposit and monthly pet fees. CP responded, no, it is a service animal, therefore, not a pet and that she did not have to pay pet deposits and pet fees. The CP stated that the man became upset and told her that yes, she had to pay the fees because she had an animal and told CP that if she did not agree to pay the fees, there was nothing more to talk about and she could not rent the unit. CP then left without being given an opportunity to fill out an application or proceed further.

Regarding the Respondents defense that that they have no records that CP submitted a rental application for the unit in question, Respondent 2001 states that although CP may have expressed interest in the unit during her visit, they have no documentation or records indicating that CP completed the application process or provided the required materials for further consideration of the accommodation request.

In addition, Respondents asserted that they do not maintain visitors logs and it is challenging to confirm who visits unless an application is formally submitted.

Respondents further note that they adhere strictly to the FHA and state laws regarding reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities. Their policy explicitly exempts service animals from pet fees and ensures that requests for reasonable accommodations are addressed promptly. Adding that they have tenants in other properties who have service animals. Respondents state they maintain clear and transparent policies regarding service animals and reasonable accommodations.

The Respondents state the claim that they refused CP's accommodation request is inaccurate. At no point did they formally deny CP's request because the process of submitting an application and verifying eligibility was never completed.

During the investigation, Respondent 2001 was asked to schedule interviews with the woman who showed the unit to CP, and the gentleman who the woman called and spoke to CP over speaker. Respondents were given the exact date and time CP viewed the unit, November 4, 2024, @ 1:00 PM. Respondents were unable to identify who the individuals were.

Respondent 2001 did provide the names of three women. CP was able to pick out the name Elce as possibly being the woman who showed the unit. Respondent Attorney states Elce would not respond to him, and he provided Elce's contact information. The investigator made attempts however, there was no answer or response from the number given for Elce.

Further, regarding the CP's assertion that the gentleman that she spoke with had a thick foreign accent, Respondent 2001 asserted that all three men have accents and could not identify who CP spoke with. Respondent Attorney stated that he had hoped Elce would be able to tell them who she called. Nonetheless the gentleman's identity has not been provided by any party.

In a Declaration provided by David Braun on March 24, 2025, Mr. Braun states, *"Without the identity of the individuals Ms. Allen spoke to Grey Roosters tried to identify the individuals and provided the names of the women to see whether any of them would be familiar to the complainant. Ms. Allen was only able to identify the male as having a foreign accent non-Hispanic."* Furthermore, in this Declaration, Mr. Braun provided information that The Grey Roosters, LLC is the management company for this property and therefore should be named as a second respondent.

To note, Mr. Braun does not acknowledge that CP recognized the name of the woman who showed CP the unit as being Elce or that after Elce was identified by CP, Elce would not respond to Respondent Attorney in an effort to obtain additional information and identification of the gentleman she called during CP's interaction with her.

In addition, Respondent 2001 was asked to provide a copy of a lease for review. Upon review, the first lease provided did not have any pet clause in it. Respondent 2001 was then asked what the pet policy was for this property. Remarkably, Respondent Attorney then provided a second lease that states, ***"PETS. No pets, dogs, cats, birds, fish or other animals shall be allowed on the Premises, even temporarily or with a visiting guest, without prior written consent of Landlord. As required by law, Service Animal(s) are the only exception to this rule. If a pet has been in a Tenant's apartment or allowed into the building, even temporarily with or without Landlord's***

permission) Tenant may be charged for cleaning, de-fleaing, deodorizing or shampooing any portion of the building or Premises at the discretion of Landlord."

During the investigation, no response was given by the Respondent when asked to explain the discrepancy that the lease to the property states no pets, however the gentleman on the phone told CP that there was a pet deposit and fees and advertisement states "Dog and Cat friendly."

In addition, Respondent 2001 was asked for their reasonable accommodation policy. However, Respondent Attorney stated that they do not have a formal accommodation policy, that they use Rocket Lawyer to draft their leases.

Regarding the Respondent's contention they have other support animals, Respondent 2001's position statement submitted on January 7, 2025, stated that they *"currently have tenants in other properties who have service animals."* When asked to provide the number of units that have service animals/emotional support animals and their contact information, Respondent Attorney responded on February 7, 2025, that *"one other tenant at this property has a service animal."* It is noted that the tenants name and contact information was provided by the Respondent.

An interview was conducted of the tenant provided by Respondent that moved into the property on December 1, 2024, who states that she has a service animal (a dog), and that she did not pay a pet deposit or pet fee. The tenant stated that she had the service animal when she moved in and that she does not personally know the owners. She further stated that she did not know if the dog was listed on her lease as she did not have it with her.

To support their position, Respondent Attorney provided said tenant's lease on March 24, 2025. The signed lease is dated November 25, 2024. Under the PETS clause in the tenant's lease it states, *"At the time of signing this Lease, Tenant shall pay to Landlord, in trust, a deposit of \$250.00, to be held and disbursed for pet damages to the Premises (if any) as provided by law. This deposit is in addition to any other security deposit stated in this Lease."* Therefore, showing that Respondent knowingly charged a pet deposit for a known service animal.

Also, in Mr. Braun's Declaration, further states *"Grey Roosters disputes that the statements Ms. Allen alleges regarding her service animal were made. Grey Roosters has and does make accommodations for service animals and began renting a unit on property to an individual less than [sic] a month after this alleged discrimination occurred."* In his declaration, Mr. Braun admits to the knowledge of a tenant at the property in question having a service animal as of December 1, 2025.

During the investigation, the Respondents were asked to provide any possible video/audio footage from November 4, 2024, as CP noticed that there were cameras around the property. Respondent Attorney stated they would check to see if there was potentially any footage. However, in Respondent Roosters position statement, they state that by the time they reviewed the footage of the ring camera, it had been overwritten.

The investigation revealed the following inconsistencies in the information provided by the Respondents:

1. In Respondent 2001's position statement dated January 7, 2025, Respondent 2001 stated they have service animals on other properties. Respondent 2001 did not mention having a service animal on the property in question as of December 1, 2024.
2. *"Their policy explicitly exempts service animals from pet fees and ensures that requests for reasonable accommodations are addressed promptly."* However, when asked for their reasonable accommodation policy, the response was that they have no formal policy.
3. The lease states no pets allowed. Yet, the advertisement for the property states "Dog and Cat friendly".
4. The lease states no pets allowed. However, the gentleman on the phone with CP told her she had to pay a pet deposit and monthly pet fee even after being told the dog was a service animal.
5. *"Their policy explicitly exempts service animals from pet fees and ensures that requests for reasonable accommodations are addressed promptly."* However, the lease submitted for the tenant with a known service animal shows that the tenant was required to pay a pet deposit.
6. Respondent Roosters state that they have two residents with service animals, the previously mentioned tenant and a second resident. However, upon review of the second resident's lease provided, there is no indication of an animal on the lease, pet rent or pet deposit noted.
7. Respondents were unable to produce the gentleman who spoke to CP over the phone although, according to Respondent Attorney, there are only three individuals that could match the description of a man with a thick foreign accent, and given the date and approximate time CP was at the property. This man still remains unidentified.
8. Respondent 2001 was also unable to initially identify the woman who showed CP the unit. Once Respondent Attorney provided possible names, CP recognized a name, Elce. Respondent Attorney stated Elce would not return his calls. Elce's contact information was given, she did not respond to the investigators phone calls or voice messages.

Furthermore, Respondents provided Alex Silva as the person named "Nalla Nalla" who placed the ad on Facebook. During the interview with Mr. Silva, he stated that his position is a maintenance man for R Rooster. Mr. Silva stated that the Facebook profile Nalla Nalla is his profile. Mr. Silva stated Mr. Braun posted the advertisement for the unit using Mr. Silva's Nalla Nalla Facebook page. Mr. Silva stated that Mr. Braun would have been the person responding to any inquiries and questions regarding the property. Mr. Silva did not have any interactions with CP, nor does Mr. Silva know who would have shown the unit to CP or who was called while CP

was there. Mr. Silva stated that he knows of two service animals that are on the property in question.

During the interview with Renan Yared, co-owner of R Roosters, stated he did not talk to CP. Mr. Yared stated he checked his records and there is nothing showing he was called to speak with CP. Mr. Yared stated that it could have only been himself or Mr. Braun that would have spoken to CP. Mr. Yared stated he did not know who showed the unit to CP. Mr. Yared stated that when showing a unit it could be one of the neighbors or it would be himself or Mr. Braun if they were in the area. Mr. Yared stated that when a unit is being shown by a neighbor, they will send the code via text to allow the unit to be shown. Mr. Yared stated it could have been Ellen, a resident that helps with cleaning and lives in Unit A. Mr. Yared stated nobody asked Ellen if she is the person who showed the unit to CP. Mr. Yared then said it could have been Elce. Mr. Yared stated he has not spoken with Elce to ask if she is the person who showed the unit. Mr. Yared stated he does not know who showed the unit or who the person would have called.

Mr. Yared was asked if they always use the same template for their leases. Mr. Yared stated yes, the same template is used. Mr. Yared stated that he is the person who handles all the leases, including adding any clauses to the lease. Mr. Yared stated that if a clause was added to a lease, it was purposely included by himself.

Mr. Yared further stated that pets are allowed as long as they are told about them. There is a two-hundred-dollar pet deposit and twenty-five dollars a month pet fee added for all pets. Mr. Yared stated service animals are not charged these fees/rent. Mr. Yared stated he is aware of two service animals at this location. Mr. Yared identified them as Alyssa, unit B and Melanie, unit D.

The investigation demonstrates that the Respondent's defenses do not negate the CP's allegations. Upon review, it is concluded the CP's version of events are credible as there are inconsistencies in the Respondents position. Ultimately, the parties have been unable to identify the witnesses that CP dealt with on November 4, 2024, there are inconsistencies in Respondents provided information and there is evidence that shows that the Respondents charged a pet deposit for a known service animal which supports the information provided by the CP stating that she was denied the opportunity to rent the unit due to deposits and fees regarding her service animal.

Given the information provided, CP was not given the opportunity to complete the application process due to it being a futile gesture as CP had already been told that he would not rent to her if she did not agree to the pet deposit and pet fees.

Therefore, there is sufficient evidence to suggest CP was denied a reasonable accommodation due to her disability.

TERMS CONDITIONS: DISABILITY

To establish a violation under the Act, the investigation must demonstrate that:

1. CP is a member of a protected class;
2. CP applied for tenancy;
3. Respondent imposed unfavorable or less favorable terms or conditions on the CP's tenancy;

4. Respondent did not impose such terms or conditions on similarly situated tenants not of the CP's protected class.

As to element one, CP provided sufficient evidence to PCOHR that she is a person with a disability. The first element is met.

As to element two, CP responded to an advertisement for an available unit, inquired about and viewed the unit. CP was ready, willing and able to rent the unit. CP arrived at the unit with her service animal. CP states that upon arrival a woman, (later identified by CP as Elce), showed CP the unit. CP began asking questions and the woman kept saying that she did not know any information regarding the unit. CP stated that once she said that she was interested in renting the unit, the woman called a man on the phone, initially speaking a foreign language. The woman later put the man on speakerphone, and he spoke to CP. CP stated that the man went over a few things with her about the unit and then asked if she had any pets. CP responded no that she had a service animal. The man on the phone then told her that she would have to pay a pet deposit and monthly pet fees. CP responded, no, it is a service animal, therefore, not a pet and that she did not have to pay pet deposits and pet fees. The man became upset and told her that yes, she had to pay the fees because she had an animal and told CP that if she did not agree to pay the fees, there was nothing more to talk about and she could not rent the unit. CP then left without being given an opportunity to fill out an application or proceed further.

Although Respondents state that while CP may have expressed interest in the unit during her visit, they have no documentation or records indicating that CP completed the application process or provided the required materials for further consideration. However, CP was denied the opportunity to complete the application process due to Respondent's insistence that CP must pay fees for her service animal. The second element is met.

As to element three, Respondents attempted to impose pet fees on CP's service animal. The third element is met.

As to element four, there is no evidence to support that the Respondents treated non-disabled tenants differently. In fact, the evidence shows that Respondents charged a disabled tenant with a service animal a pet deposit as shown in that tenant lease agreement. Otherwise, Respondents assert that they do not allow pets on the property in question. Therefore, CP's only comparator is a similarly situated disabled person who was charged and paid the pet deposit for their service animal. The fourth element fails.

Thus, there is insufficient evidence to suggest CP was treated differently and subjected to different terms and conditions due to her disability.

VI. CONCLUSION:

Therefore, based on the foregoing evidence and analysis of the investigation, set forth above, due to the discouragement in applying for the property, there is sufficient evidence to establish a denial of a reasonable accommodation. As such, it is recommended that a "Reasonable Cause" exists to believe that the Respondent engaged in a discriminatory housing practice in violation of Section 804(f)(3)(B) of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Act of 1988 and Chapter 70 of the Code of Ordinances of Pinellas County.

It is recommended that a “No Reasonable Cause” exists to believe that the RP subjected the CP to different terms and conditions in violation of Section 804(f)(2) of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Act of 1988 and Chapter 70 of the Code of Ordinances of Pinellas County.

VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Notwithstanding this determination by the Pinellas County Office of Human Rights (PCOHR) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Fair Housing Act provides that the complainant may file a civil action in an appropriate federal district court or state court within two years after the occurrence or termination of the alleged discriminatory housing practice. The computation of this two-year period does not include the time during which this administrative proceeding was pending. In addition, upon the application of either party to such civil action, the court may appoint an attorney or may authorize the commencement of or continuation of the civil action without the payment of fees, costs, or security, if the court determines that such party is financially unable to bear the costs of the lawsuit.

The Department's regulations implementing the Act require that a dismissal, if any, be publicly disclosed, unless the Respondent requests that no such release be made. Such request must be made by the Respondent within thirty (30) days of receipt of the determination to the Field Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. Notwithstanding such request by the respondent, the fact of a dismissal, including the names of all parties, is public information and is available upon request.

A copy of the final investigative report can be obtained from the Pinellas County Office of Human Rights.

Betina Baron
Betina Baron, Compliance Manager

05/27/25
Date