

**District of Columbia
Office of Human Rights**



**Attorney-Drafted Charges
Program Guidance**

March 6, 2026

History of OHR's Attorney-Drafted Charge Program ("Program")

In 2019, OHR conducted a Pilot Program to determine whether to accept attorney-drafted charges. The evaluation of that Pilot Program and the potential implementation of a permanent attorney-drafted charge process was interrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Between July 15, 2024, and March 3, 2025, OHR re-launched its Attorney-Drafted Charge Pilot Program, taking into account feedback from local bar associations and community groups, recommendations from the Council of the District of Columbia Committee on Public Works and Operations, and lessons learned from OHR's 2019 Pilot Program. After receiving positive feedback from advocacy groups and community-based organizations regarding the re-launched Pilot Program, OHR decided to make the Attorney-Drafted Charge Program a permanent part of OHR's intake and complaint charging process. This guidance replaces the Pilot Program guidance issued on July 15, 2024, and should be referenced for all attorney-drafted charges filed on or after March 6, 2026.

OHR's Role in the Intake and Charge Process

During the intake process, OHR's role is to assist complainants with articulating their allegations and claims of discrimination that fall within OHR's jurisdiction. Individuals **do not need an attorney** to file an initial complaint or finalize a charge with OHR.

A Charge of Discrimination ("Charge") is meant to be a **summary** of the complainant's claims, reflecting relevant facts and dates, discrete issues, a general chronology, if warranted, and a recitation of any **pertinent events or actions** that support the claims presented in the Intake Questionnaire and captured during the Intake Interview.

All Charges must be reviewed by OHR for legal sufficiency and jurisdiction prior to docketing, even charges drafted by attorney or non-attorney representatives. If OHR determines after review of the Charge that OHR has jurisdiction over the stated claims, and the Charge properly states a claim for relief, Complainant and/or their representative will have an opportunity during the investigation phase to provide additional background information and evidence in support of the Charge.

Step One: The Initial Written Complaint

The complaint process at OHR begins with submitting an Initial Written Complaint ("IWC"), also known as the Intake Questionnaire. The IWC may be submitted to OHR via an online form, email, mail, fax, or in-person. **All complainants, whether represented or not, must fill**

out the IWC and submit it to OHR.

The IWC constitutes the filing date for statute of limitation purposes. OHR has different IWC forms for different types of claims (employment, housing, public accommodations, education, etc.). Please check to make sure the correct IWC form is submitted at intake. Submission of the incorrect form may delay processing of the complaint. Please see OHR's website at https://bit.ly/OHR_FileADiscriminationComplaint.

Note for Practitioners: To determine timeliness for filing only, OHR will accept an EEOC Form 5 (or Form 5A) submission, and the date an attorney-drafted Charge on EEOC Form 5 is submitted to OHR will constitute the filing date. However, an attorney-drafted Charge submitted on an EEOC Form 5, **will not otherwise be treated as an IWC** for OHR's internal processing purposes. All complainants, even if they submit an EEOC Form 5 Charge, must also submit an **OHR IWC** form.

Step Two: The Intake Interview

If, based on the information provided in the IWC, OHR determines that it likely has jurisdiction over the matter, the next step in OHR's process is generally for an OHR Intake Officer to schedule an Intake Interview with the complainant and, if represented, their attorney or non-attorney representative, prior to drafting and docketing a formal Charge of Discrimination. In some cases, OHR may follow-up with the complainant or their representative prior to determining jurisdiction to gather additional information about a potential claim or complaint.

A. If No Intake Interview is Required

If an IWC and/or attorney-drafted Charge otherwise meets the criteria detailed in this guidance, OHR determines that it has jurisdiction over the complainant's allegations, and the Charge clearly and concisely articulates Complainant's claims over which OHR has jurisdiction, OHR may, at its discretion, determine that an Intake Interview is not necessary prior to the docketing of a formal Charge of Discrimination.

Note for Practitioners: At all times during the intake process, OHR retains the discretion to schedule or not schedule an Intake Interview.

The decision whether or not to schedule an Intake Interview or follow-up with the complainant and their representative(s) prior to the acceptance and docketing of a Charge is at all times left to the discretion of OHR and the Intake Manager. A complainant's (or their representative's) failure to comply with OHR's intake or complaint processing guidelines may

be grounds for dismissal of the complaint.

B. If OHR Determines that an Intake Interview is Required

If OHR determines, after review of an IWC and/or Attorney-Drafted Charge, that OHR requires more information to determine jurisdiction, to properly or concisely articulate the complainant's claims, to accept the Charge for processing, or to clarify the bases for relief, OHR may, in its discretion, decide to schedule an Intake Interview prior to submission of or acceptance of the attorney-drafted Charge. In such cases, the complainant, and their attorney or non-attorney representative, **must attend** the Intake Interview, unless otherwise notified by the Intake Manager. Failure to do so could result in **administrative dismissal** of the IWC.

Additionally, if the Attorney-Drafted Charge appears to include allegations that are untimely, outside of OHR's jurisdiction, or fail to state a claim, OHR reserves the right to either schedule an Intake Interview to clarify the issues or to send a new Charge for the complainant's signature that does not include allegations that are untimely, are outside OHR's jurisdiction, or fail to state a claim.

Note for Practitioners: OHR may dismiss complaints after an Intake Interview, and before the drafting of a Charge, for reasons including lack of jurisdiction, lack of sufficient information, failure to state a claim, the filing of frivolous claims, or for other administrative reasons in the exercise of OHR's inherent prosecutorial discretion.

Step Three: The Charge of Discrimination and Attorney-Drafted Charge

OHR typically drafts the Charge of Discrimination, which is a separate document from the IWC, after conducting the Intake Interview. As part of the permanent Attorney-Drafted Charge Program, an attorney-drafted Charge may be submitted to OHR as follows:

A. Attachment to Initial Written Complaint

In cases where an attorney or non-attorney representative files an IWC on a complainant's behalf, the Charge may be included as an **attachment to the IWC submission**, at the time of the filing of the Intake Questionnaire.

If an attorney-drafted Charge is submitted to OHR along with the IWC submission, it will be reviewed by the Intake Officer and, when necessary, the Intake Manager. If the Intake Manager has determined that no intake interview is necessary after receiving an IWC and Attorney-Drafted Charge, the Charge shall be processed for docketing.

B. Attorney-Drafted Charge after IWC

In cases where a legal representative enters their appearance after a complainant has already filed an IWC, an Attorney-Drafted Charge may be submitted to the Intake Officer **within thirty (30) business days after the filing of the IWC**, or within **seven (7) business days after the Intake Interview**, whichever comes first.¹

If the Intake Manager determines that the Attorney-Drafted Charge is **consistent with OHR's guidelines, outlined below**, raises timely claims, properly states a claim for relief over which OHR has jurisdiction, and clearly defines the relevant parties, timeline, claims, issues, and basis or bases for the complaint, OHR will docket the Charge of Discrimination and forward it to OHR's Mediation and Investigation Units for further processing.

If the attorney-drafted Charge is **not consistent with OHR's guidelines**, if the claims are untimely, or if the Charge otherwise fails to state a claim for relief over which OHR has jurisdiction, OHR will contact the attorney to review the deficiencies; clarify the timeline, issues, claims, and bases for investigation; and revise the Charge so that it is consistent with OHR's requirements.

If a complainant or their representative disagrees with what claim(s) OHR has accepted for investigation or wishes to pursue additional claims in a court of competent jurisdiction, the complainant may withdraw the entire case from OHR and file a private right of action on all claims in court. *See* D.C. Code § 2-1403.16(a).² As of October 1, 2025, the D.C. Human Rights Act ("DCHRA") allows claims to be filed in a court of competent jurisdiction within **two years** from the incidents in question. *Id.* "The timely filing of a complaint with the office...shall toll the running of the statute of limitations while the complaint is pending." *Id.* The statute of limitations for filing in court may be different for other laws that OHR enforces, including for claims brought pursuant to the D.C. Family and Medical Leave Act.

Note for Practitioners: The final decision on what claims to accept in the Charge always remains with OHR. Additionally, OHR does not issue partial dismissal orders for claims not accepted in the charge.

C. Multi-Complainant Charges

OHR does not currently accept or process class-action charges due to budget, staffing, and

¹ Or, if the complainant prefers, OHR will draft the Charge and forward it to the Complainant's attorney or non-attorney representative for final review and Complainant's signature.

² Note that a complainant is not required to exhaust administrative remedies under the District of Columbia Human Rights Act ("DCHRA") by filing first with OHR prior to filing a private cause of action in court.

resource constraints. However, complainants and their counsel may file “**group**” charges – where multiple complainants are raising the same or similar claims against one respondent or group of respondents. In such cases, **each individual complainant** must file their own IWC *and* their own Charge of Discrimination. Group charges will be consolidated for processing and investigated together.

In addition, OHR’s Director has the authority to initiate **Director’s Inquiries** into potential discriminatory practices or policies that indicate a pattern of behavior in the District, such as industry-wide practices or a particular policy that may have a discriminatory effect on a particular group or protected trait. The guidelines for Director’s Inquiries can be found at 4 DCMR § 900, *et seq.*

Attorney-Drafted Charge Requirements

For the benefit of complainants and their attorney or non-attorney representatives, OHR has included a list of **Charge-drafting requirements** below. Please note that these Charge requirements are not exhaustive, and OHR may require additional information in the Charge depending on the type of claim, the parties involved, the bases or allegations raised, and/or the statute(s) involved.

A. Length and Format of Charge

A Charge **should not be longer than two (2) pages in length and must be submitted one-sided only**. The font size should be no smaller than 11. All headings should conform to OHR standards as outlined below. Exceptions to this page limit may be made in cases involving numerous issues, or claims involving continuing violations, such as hostile environment and harassment claims.

B. Limit of One D.C. Statute per Charge

Generally, OHR requires that each claim involving a separate District statute must be on a separate Charge. For example, if a complainant wishes to allege three claims: (1) sex discrimination under the D.C. Human Rights Act (“DCHRA”); (2) leave interference under the D.C. Family & Medical Leave Act (“DCFMLA”); and (3) failure to accommodate under the Protecting Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (“PPWFA”), the attorney **MUST submit three separate Charges** – one for each statute.

This is because certain claims, such as DCFMLA and PPWFA claims, are adjudicated under different procedures than DCHRA claims, and have different appeal rights and rights to file

civil actions in court. Separate determination letters must be issued on each claim due to these different statutory and regulatory requirements.

However, if an Attorney-Drafted Charge implicates companion federal laws, for example, both Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Americans with Disabilities Act, all relevant federal statutes should be listed on the same Charge filed with OHR.

C. Timeliness of Claims

In private sector cases, OHR will only accept claims for investigation that involve incidents or discovery of incidents that occurred within **one year** of the date a complaint is filed with OHR (which begins with the filing of the IWC. 4 DCMR § 702.1(a)).

In D.C. government cases involving employment discrimination claims (with the exception of DCFMLA, PPWFA, and sexual harassment claims under the DCHRA) OHR will only accept claims for investigation that involve incidents or discovery of incidents that were brought to the attention of an EEO Counselor within **180 days** of the discriminatory act, and that were filed with OHR (which begins with the filing of the IWC) within **15 days** of the issuance of an Exit Letter by the EEO Counselor. D.C. Code § 2-1403.04; 4 DCMR §§ 105-106.³ EEO counseling is not required for claims against the government brought under the DCFMLA or the PPWFA, and/or DCHRA claims of sexual harassment.

Information outside of the statute of limitations may be provided as background information on the final Charge of Discrimination, but it should be kept to a minimum in the procedural history section of the Charge and labeled as **“Background.”** For example, in a discriminatory failure to promote claim, facts or background details regarding past disparate treatment may be included in a summary fashion as “background” evidence supporting the present claim of failure to promote but should be clearly labeled as such and should be distinguished from the timely allegation of failure to promote.

D. Contents of Charge

The allegations must **state a claim under laws enforced by OHR** and should include specific information about the parties, a statement of particulars with dates and identification of the alleged discriminatory actions, and a statement of the law violated. The below provides

³ Pursuant to 4 DCMR § 105.1, a government employee or applicant must consult an EEO Counselor within 180 days of the alleged discriminatory practice (except in cases of sexual harassment or claims alleging a violation of the DCFMLA). After being consulted, and during the final interview, the EEO Counselor shall issue an Exit Letter, informing complainant of his or her right to file a formal complaint with OHR within fifteen (15) days of the final interview, if the matter has not been resolved to complainant's satisfaction. *Id.* at § 105.5-6.

guidance for each section of the Charge:

1. **Parties' Information**

a. **Complainant(s) - Each complainant should have their own Charge**

- Name, home address, telephone number, and email for Complainant.
- Complainant's attorney's or representative's contact information.
- Date of birth of Complainant should only be provided in age discrimination cases or in the case of a charge brought on behalf of a minor child.

Note for Practitioners: For complaints brought “on behalf of” or “OBO” a minor child, an adult with limited capacity or competency, or a third-party, please ensure that all complainants are distinctly identified and listed, including the initials of the minor child or the name of the limited-capacity adult. This ensures that all interested or aggrieved parties are properly identified at the outset of the Charge.

b. **Respondent(s) - Please list all named respondents on one Charge**

- Name and address of each Respondent, including individual Respondents.⁴
- Corporate name and/or business address of Respondent(s), if Respondent is a corporation, organization, business, or other such entity.
- If available, please also provide the Registered Agent's name in this section.
- Email and telephone of Respondent(s), if available.
- Owner's name and/or name of corporate officer, if known.
- Trade name may be provided in parentheses and denoted by “d/b/a.”
- If the business address of Respondent is outside of the District of Columbia, the location of the violation in the District of Columbia must be included, either in this section or in the narrative of the Charge.
- In **Housing Discrimination** cases: List the number of properties owned and/or managed in the District by the Respondent, if known.
- In **Employment Discrimination** cases: List the estimated number of employees of Respondent located in the United States, with the number of employees of Respondent located in the District of Columbia indicated

⁴ Note that under the DCHRA, a complainant may file a complaint against an individual respondent, in their personal capacity, and/or a corporate or business entity respondent. If a complainant seeks to name both an individual and a business entity as the responding respondent, please indicate so clearly and list each respondent's name and address separately.

in parentheses (e.g., “50 (25 in D.C.)”).

2. Dates Discrimination Took Place

- a. All Charges should include dates or, at a minimum, a date range, for the cited incidents so that OHR can determine whether it has jurisdiction over the asserted claims.
- b. Check “**continuing action**” ONLY for hostile environment/harassment claims that include allegations beyond the one-year statute of limitation period.

Note for Practitioners: “Continuing action” should not be checked if you are alleging ongoing discrimination under theories other than hostile environment or harassment; rather, indicate the particulars as described in the section below.

3. Particulars (Narrative Section of the Charge)

a. **Introduction**

- Date of OHR IWC submitted to OHR;
- **For DC government cases**, you must also provide the date of the initial EEO Counselor contact, the date Complainant received the Exit Letter, and the date the **Exit Letter** was submitted to OHR;
- Describe the relationship between the parties, including any particular job title or role of Complainant, the type of the Respondent, and Complainant’s qualification for employment, housing, etc.
- If the address where the incident occurred is different from Respondent’s business address, include it here.

b. **Claims - Please use Headers (specific claims asserted)**

- Each legal theory **must be labeled and underlined** and must be described in a separate paragraph. For example, if retaliation and disparate treatment are alleged, each issue must be articulated in its own distinct paragraph with headers such as “Retaliation” and “Disparate Treatment.”
- The individual paragraph for each legal theory should include a concise summary statement of the factual allegations that support each element of the legal theory.
- If the same set of factual allegations supports more than one legal theory, claim, or basis, please still include the same summary of facts under each separate legal theory. OHR will review these statements to ensure they state a claim.
- Be sure to include **relevant dates**, or at a minimum, a date range, for the cited incidents.

c. **Conclusion**

- The Concluding paragraph of the Charge should identify the pertinent federal and District statutes.
- OHR will **NOT docket** a Charge that does NOT allege a violation of a District law that OHR enforces.

d. **Certification:** A short statement describing any other action, civil, criminal, or administrative in nature, instituted in any other forum or agency based on the same unlawful discriminatory practice as is alleged in the Charge.

If Complainant has already filed a claim alleging the same unlawful discriminatory practice in **a court of competent jurisdiction**, or with the **United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) or Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”)**, Complainant should NOT also file the same factual and legal allegations in a Charge of Discrimination with OHR. OHR will dismiss such cases for lack of jurisdiction, to avoid duplicative investigations, and/or to comply with OHR’s federal work-share agreements with its federal partner agencies.

Particulars and Conclusion - Charge Examples

OHR has provided sample Charges for each type of enforcement area. These examples are provided **ONLY** to illustrate charge language that is consistent with the guidance above. Such language must be inserted in the **Particulars** section of the template Charge of Discrimination form. These can be located in the appendices below.

Appendix A - Employment Discrimination

Sample 1: Charge of Discrimination (Employment - Private Sector)

I was hired by Respondent's restaurant in January 2024 as a Stock Clerk. I believe that I have been discriminated against in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment based on my sex (female), and subjected to retaliation for participating in a protected activity for the following reasons:

Sexual Harassment (Quid Pro Quo) - Sex

I originally applied for this job prior to January 2024. As a condition of my employment, I was asked to perform sex acts with one of Respondent's Managers, Joe Smith (male), in late December 2023. Respondent's Manager used expletives to tell me, "If you want the job, you need to (perform) oral sex." After I was hired in January 2024, Respondent's Manager, Mr. Smith, kept asking me for sexual favors, stating that my job depended on it.

Sexual Harassment (Hostile Work Environment) - Sex

In or around late April or early May 2024, I raised the issue of Mr. Smith's sexual requests with Respondent's General Manager, Fred Thomas (male), and Mr. Smith was transferred to a different location. However, a few months later, one of Mr. Smith's friends, Tony Johnson (male), became my Supervisor. He also began to make sexual advances toward me, but I did not comply with his sexual advances. I complained to Mr. Thomas on May 15, 2024, about Mr. Johnson's behavior, but Mr. Thomas did not take any action.

Retaliation (Terms and Conditions, Discipline) - Complaining of Sexual Harassment

Shortly after I raised my complaints with Mr. Thomas, he began to reduce my hours, and my work shifts were cut. Then, on May 31, 2024, I did not receive a paycheck for my work. I complained to Mr. Thomas about missing my paycheck and unpaid wages on June 3, 2024, and he immediately suspended me for three days for insubordination.

Retaliation (Discharge) - Complaining of Sexual Harassment

Subsequently, on June 30, 2024, Respondent terminated my employment. I contend Respondent terminated my employment in retaliation for complaining about sexual harassment by Mr. Smith and Mr. Johnson.

Therefore, I charge Respondent with unlawful discriminatory acts in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended. I have not commenced any other action, civil, criminal or administrative, based on the above allegations, other than the instant Charge of Discrimination that has been cross-filed with the EEOC.

Sample 2: Charge of Discrimination (Employment - D.C. Government)

Complainant first filed with an EEO Counselor on December 12, 2023. The EEO Counselor directed Complainant to another EEO Counselor, and the Counselor issued an Exit Letter on February 1, 2024. Complainant filed her Initial Written Complaint with OHR on February 10, 2024. Complainant again contacted the EEO Counselor on April 7, 2024, and the EEO Counselor issued another Exit Letter on May 19, 2024. Complainant submitted the Exit letter to OHR on the same day.

Respondent hired me in May 2023 as a Legal Assistant. I believe that Respondent has discriminated against me in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment based on my sex (female) and race (Asian) for the following reasons:

Disparate Treatment (Discharge) - Sex and Race

Since my hiring, I noticed Respondent's leadership team, who are all white, pushing people out that they did not accept. On October 31, 2023, my supervisor, Amanda Simmons (white), called me into her office and notified me that Respondent was terminating my employment.

When I asked about a reason for termination, Ms. Simmons stated the agency was deciding to get rid of my position and they did not need to give me a reason. She also stated the agency could fire me for any reason, as I was on a probationary period. The letter of termination dated October 28, 2023, stated that they came to this decision "because [I was] determined to be unfit for the job." Prior to my termination, I have received only positive feedback on my work and work product, and I received favorable reviews on my 6-month informal evaluation.

However, Respondent has kept my male colleague Eric Brown (male, white), who was in the same position as mine, even though I was more experienced and qualified than he was with my previous ten-year work experience as volunteer with legal aid organizations. Therefore, I assert that Respondent discriminated against me based on my sex and race when Respondent terminated my employment despite my qualifications when they continued to employ a white male employee.

Therefore, I charge Respondent with unlawful discriminatory acts in violation of the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. I have not commenced any other civil, criminal, or administrative action based on the above allegations, other than the instant Charge of Discrimination, which has been cross-filed with the EEOC.

Appendix B: Housing Discrimination

Sample 3: Charge of Discrimination (Housing)

Complainant alleges that Respondents engaged in unlawful discrimination based on familial status and source of income (Housing Choice Voucher) when Respondents refused to rent her the property at 323 Oglethorpe Street, NW Washington, DC 20011 (“the subject property”). Specifically, the allegations of unlawful discrimination are as follows:

Discriminatory Refusal to Rent - Familial Status

On or about March 27, 2025, Complainant submitted an online application to Respondent for rental of the subject property.

On March 31, 2025, Complainant received a denial email from Zillow, that stated the following: Insufficient rent to income ratio and the property unable to accommodate certain application request move in date and numbers of occupants.

Complainant believes because she has a large family of 6, which includes (4) minor children, she was denied an opportunity to rent the subject property due to her familial status.

Discriminatory Refusal to Rent - Source of Income

On or about March 27, 2025, Complainant submitted an online application to Respondent for rental of the subject property. The property is a four-bedroom rental listed for \$4,650 per month. Complainant states that her 4-bedroom voucher would cover the full rental amount of the unit.

On March 28, 2025, Complainant received a response from Colleen Wellington-Caban, stating that applications were being “preliminarily reviewed” and that tours would be scheduled for conditionally approved applicants. However, the Complainant was never given an opportunity to tour the property.

On March 31, 2025, Complainant received a denial email from Zillow, that stated the following: Insufficient rent to income ratio and the property unable to accommodate certain application request move in date and numbers of occupants. Complainant believes that she was not given a fair opportunity to rent the subject property, as would other prospective applicants who did not have a Housing Choice voucher.

Other Discriminatory Acts § 2-1402.21 (g)(1)(B)

Complainant alleges that the Respondent discriminated against her based on her source of income (Housing Choice Voucher) by imposing income requirements as described above, which also constitutes other discriminatory acts based on source of income under the DC Human Rights Act.

Appendix C: Public Accommodations Discrimination

Sample 4: Charge of Discrimination (Hostile Services)

I believe that I have been discriminated against in terms, conditions, and privileges of public accommodation based on my Sexual Orientation (Member of the LGBTQ Community) for the following reasons:

Hostile Services - Sexual Orientation

I believe that Respondent failed to provide full and equal enjoyment of services of public accommodations because of my sexual orientation. On November 17, 2024, I received services in a hostile manner when my partner and I complained about the smell of the food that we ordered. The Owner/ Manager then directed homophobic slurs towards us by calling us a slur related to our sexual orientation, claimed that we refused to pay our bill, banned us from the restaurant, and called the police on us. Other customers (Heterosexual) were not similarly treated.

Sample 5: Charge of Discrimination (Denial of Services)

I believe that I have been discriminated against in terms, conditions, and privileges of public accommodation based on familial status (minor child) for the following reasons:

Denial of Service - Familial Status

I believe that Respondent has denied me equal enjoyment in services of a public accommodation because of my familial status. On April 7, 2025, I reserved a short-term rental in Washington, DC through platform Booking.com, for a family trip that included my young child. After booking the condominium located at 1228 16th Street, NE, Unit #3, Washington, DC, 20002, I later discovered that the listing had a discriminatory house rule on the Booking.com listing page: "No children allowed." I immediately requested to cancel the reservation and receive a full refund; however, the host refused my request. I contacted Booking.com customer service multiple times between April 16-23, to resolve the matter to no avail. Yet, I have not received a refund. I believed that the Respondent treated me unfavorably because of my familial status.

Discriminatory Advertisement - Familial Status

In addition, Respondent's advertisement contained a description in the house rules reflecting a discriminatory statement, "No children allowed," which led me to cancel my reservation.

Appendix D -Educational Institutions Discrimination

Sample 6: Charge of Discrimination - Example A

I believe that I have been discriminated against in the terms, conditions, and privileges of an educational institution based on my race (Black) for the following reasons:

Disparate Treatment (Program Fees) - Race

I am a graduate student of the Family Nurse Practitioner program with Respondent. There are ten (10) students in my Cohort. However, I am the only Black student in the Family Nurse Practitioner program, along with nine (9) white students. I had to pay \$1,050.00 for my clinical practicum preceptor. However, the nine other students (white) did not have to pay. I believe I was subjected to different terms and conditions by Respondent based on my race.

Sample 7: Charge of Discrimination - Example B

I believe that I have been discriminated against in terms, conditions, and privileges of an educational institution based on my disability for the following reasons:

Failure to Accommodate - Disability

On September 19, 2024, I believe that Respondent failed to provide me with reasonable accommodation because of my disability. I requested that my 12-hour Constitutional Law I exam be split into 2 days because after eight hours I am unable to focus as a result of my disability. On October 28, 2024, Respondent failed to grant my request. On the same date, I requested an appeal of Respondent's decision. On November 7, 2024, Associate Dean denied my appeal because she believed that it posed a security risk concern, and she said that studies show that as I would be sleeping, my brain would still be thinking about the questions.

Failure to Accommodate (Unreasonable Delay) - Disability

On December 3, 2024, I requested a reasonable accommodation for Respondent to re-braille my hardcopy "Evidence" exam because the professor had changed the test; this accommodation was granted. However, Respondent failed to obtain the exam in a timely manner and my exam administration was delayed by 36 days. I believed that the Respondent had treated me unfavorably because of my disability.

In summer 2024, I was approved for a peer notetaker accommodation from Respondent as a part of Accessibility Services, which included uploading notes from each class twice per week. For my Constitutional Law II course, I was not provided with any such notes until April 21, 2025. On this day, all of the notes for this class for the entire semester were uploaded at once, and this only provides me with ten days to study before the final exam for this class. The failure to provide the notes throughout the semester and in a timely fashion has prevented me from outlining the course, studying the materials and being prepared for the exam.

Sample 8: Charge of Discrimination (“On Behalf Of”)⁵

My minor child (T.P.), a student who attended [Name of School] (Respondent) was denied reasonable accommodation based on his multiple disabilities and religion (Jewish) for the following reasons:

Denial of Reasonable Accommodation - Disability and Religion

On January 7, 2024, I requested a reasonable accommodation for HRP services for the H Program. However, Respondent: (a) required me to “assume complete financial responsibility” for securing the medical communications needed to place my minor child in the H Program; and (b) denied that request by acting with undue delay when they failed to start H services as anticipated on February 3, 2024; and (c) failed to engage in the interactive process when they “refused” to meet with me to “discuss supports/accommodations” needed for T.P. to participate in the H Program.

Respondent failed to accommodate T.P.’s religion (Jewish), when Respondent scheduled T.P. for Saturday morning classes despite my repeated objections, because these Saturday morning classes interfered with our religious obligations.

Therefore, I charge Respondent with unlawful discriminatory acts in violation of the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended. I have not commenced any other civil, criminal, or administrative action based on the above allegations other than the instant Charge of Discrimination.

Sample 9: Charge of Discrimination (“obo”)

I believe that my minor child (S.R.) has been discriminated against in the terms, conditions, and privileges of an educational institution based on my child's disability for the following reasons:

Failure to Accommodate - Disability

During the school year of August 2025, I requested speech therapy and specialized classroom instruction as reasonable accommodation on behalf of my minor child (S.R.). However, the Respondent failed to implement the reasonable accommodation requests or engage in an interactive process.

Therefore, I charge Respondent with unlawful discriminatory acts in violation of the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended. I have not commenced any other action civil, criminal, or administrative based on the above allegations other than the instant Charge of Discrimination.

⁵ Note that when claims are being brought on behalf of a minor child, or an adult with diminished capacity, OHR typically uses the phrase “obo” (“on behalf of”) in the caption of the Charge and lists only the child’s/”obo” complainant’s initials in the Charge. If claims are being brought on behalf of BOTH the complaining adult AND the minor child/adult with diminished capacity, the Charge should clearly delineate the claims being raised by a) the adult complainant and b) the “obo” complainant. This is because, if the minor child reaches the age of adulthood during the pendency of the OHR process (or an adult regains legal capacity), the claims brought on behalf of the child transfer to the child when they reach the age of majority.