



Maine Human Rights Commission

51 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333-0051

Physical location: 19 Union Street, Augusta, ME 04330

Phone (207) 624-6290 ▪ Fax (207) 624-8729 ▪ TTY: Maine Relay 711

www.maine.gov/mhrc

Amy M. Sneirson
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Barbara Archer Hirsch
COMMISSION COUNSEL

INVESTIGATOR'S REPORT MHRC # H16-0401, HUD Inquiry # 515311 November 28, 2016

Charles Clay (Bangor)

v.

DES Properties, LLC (Bangor)

I. Summary of Case:

Complainant alleged that Respondent discriminated against him in the terms and conditions of the housing application process based on disability by refusing to waive the pet fee for Complainant's assistance animal. Respondent, the owner and manager of the property Complainant inquired about renting, denied discriminatory intent. The Maine Human Rights Commission Investigator conducted a preliminary investigation, which included a thorough review of the materials submitted by the parties, an Issues and Resolution Conference ("IRC"), and requests for further information and documents. Based on this information, the Investigator recommends that the Commission make a finding that there are reasonable grounds to believe Respondent discriminated against Complainant in housing on the basis of disability.

II. Jurisdictional Data:

- 1) Date of alleged discrimination: June 6, 2016.
- 2) Date complaint filed with the Maine Human Rights Commission ("Commission"): August 25, 2016.
- 3) Respondent is subject to the Maine Human Rights Act ("MHRA") and the federal Fair Housing Act, as well as state and federal housing regulations.
- 4) Respondent is represented by Matthew Cobb, Esq. Complainant is not represented by counsel.

III. Development of Facts:

- 1) Complainant provided the following in support of his claims:
 - a) Complainant called Respondent after his wife had viewed an apartment owned by Respondent and was told that a fee was charged for assistance animals. Respondent spoke to the property manager ("Property Manager") over the phone and recorded the conversation. Property Manager confirmed that Respondent charges a fee for assistance animals, which Complainant believes is unlawful.