

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS SETTLEMENTS CLOSED 2015

- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Department of Corrections** – Complainant is nursing mother. Complainant, with her three minor children, went to Northwest State Correctional Facility to allow the children to visit with their incarcerated father. While there, Complainant was told that she could not nurse her youngest child at the facility and was not offered a private place to nurse. After filing a complaint with the VHRC Respondents agreed to make changes to their policy; have staff participate in training on this policy; and pay Complainant the sum of \$10,000.00.
- ▶ **Vermont Inmate v. Vermont Department of Corrections** – Complainant is a person with a disability due to a hearing impairment. Complainant alleged discrimination due to denial of access to a TTY for external communications. After filing a complaint with the VHRC Respondent agreed to purchase a new TTY at the Southern State Correctional Facility.
- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Privately Owned Vermont Restaurant and Property Owner** – Complainant is a person with an ambulatory impairment. Complainant alleged discrimination based on the existence of a physical barrier between the restaurant’s dining area and restroom: a flight of stairs. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondents made significant modifications to the restaurant to bring it in compliance with the ADA Title III regulations.
- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Town Municipality**– Complainant is a person with an ambulatory disability who uses a wheelchair. Complainant alleged discrimination based on buildings operated by the town for official business being inaccessible due to physical barriers. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondents agreed to implement all “administrative requirements” of the ADA/ADAAA to make buildings accessible and in compliance with other ADA/ADAAA requirements. Respondents additionally agreed to create a grievance process for any future citizen to address accessibility issues.

- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Based Retail Business** – Complainant is a person with a disability. Complainant alleged discrimination based on lack of accessible parking spaces near the main entrance to the store. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondents agreed to add additional accessible parking, with proper signage, near the main entrance to the store.
- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Based Retail Business and Pharmacy** – Complainant is a person with a disability. He has a service animal. Complainant alleged discrimination when the Respondent asked him to provide documentation regarding his service animal while he was in the store. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondents paid Complainant the sum of \$500.00; agreed to provide training to all associates, managers and supervisors on service animals; and to create a store policy regarding service animals.
- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Medical Office** – Complainant is a person with a disability. He has a service animal. Complainant alleged discrimination when the Respondent refused to allow him to have his service animal accompany him to medical appointments. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondent agreed to allow Complainant to have his service animal accompany him to medical appointments.
- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Based Bank** – Complainant is a person with a disability. Complainant alleged discrimination when denied a reasonable accommodation request for one contact person at the bank to assist him with his numerous banking issues. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondent's agreed to have one bank employee, at the location nearest Complainant, be his contact person when he had 'general' banking questions or needs not related to mortgage loan matters.
- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Art Center** – Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of Creed (religion) when patrons of a separate event at the Center yelled derogatory statements against him and other Christians attending an event and refused them entry to the separate event on the basis of their religious practice. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondents agreed to have the Complainant speak to the board of the Art Center; to establish a non-discrimination statement; and to develop a grievance process to address any future allegations of discrimination.
- ▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Department of Children & Families, Economic Services Division** – Complainant is a person with an ambulatory impairment and uses a wheelchair. Complainant alleged discrimination when

Respondents failed to provide her with handicapped accessible emergency housing, instead placing her in non-accessible emergency housing causing her physical injuries. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondent agreed to pay Complainant the sum of \$9,000.00 to include attorney fees and to follow “Interpretive Memos” when providing housing to persons with disabilities.

▶ **Vermont Citizen (o/b/o minor child) v. Vermont Public School** – Complainant is a person with a disability. Complainant alleged discrimination when the school failed to enforce a safety plan by allowing an individual criminally charged with an attack on him to be present on school grounds unsupervised. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondents agreed to add Complainant's identifiable disability to his 504 plan and to not allow the other individual to be unsupervised on school grounds or attend after school activities unless authorized by counsel.

▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Based Retail Store and Pharmacy** – Complainant is a person with a disability. The nature of his disability can sometimes cause him to speak out loud to himself, speak loudly to others and make dramatic hand gestures. Complainant alleged discrimination when he received a Notice Against Trespass Order from Respondent after a visit to their establishment. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondents agreed to pay Complainant the sum of \$350.00.

▶ **Vermont Citizen v. Vermont Non-Profit** – Complainant is a person with a disability. Complainant alleged discrimination after Respondent denied his request for a tactile interpretation services. After filing a complaint with the VHRC, Respondent agreed to solicit traditional American Sign Language (ASL) and tactile interpreters for performances; to provide Complainant with a list of performances at which they intended to provide traditional ASL interpretation services; and to pay for these interpretation services.