UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA SHREVEPORT DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
Plaintiff,)) CASE NO:
V.)
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BOSSIER CITY,)
Defendant.)

COMPLAINT

The United States of America ("United States") files this Complaint, alleging as follows:
1. This action is brought by the United States to enforce the provisions of the Fair
Housing Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 3601 *et seq*.

This Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1345 and 42 U.S.C.
 § 3614(a).

3. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because (a) the events giving rise to this action occurred in this judicial district; (b) the properties that are the subject of this action are situated in this judicial district; and (c) the defendant is located in this judicial district.

I. Housing Authority of Bossier City

4. Defendant Housing Authority of the Bossier City, Louisiana ("HABC") is a political subdivision of the State of Louisiana and is a public body, corporate and politic, created to provide decent, safe and sanitary dwellings to persons of low income in the City of Bossier ("Bossier"). La. Rev. Stat. §§ 40:384; 40:392.

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 2 of 11 PageID #: 2

5. Between 1953 and 1985, the HABC developed seven public housing complexes containing 437 housing units that it continues to own and operate as public housing today. All of these housing units are federally subsidized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, 42 U.S.C. § 1437 *et seq*. The HABC's public housing complexes are: Cisco Homes, established in 1953; Mariah Bush Homes, established in 1958; Central Park, established in 1958; Hall Park, established in 1967; Scott/Dickerson, established in 1969; Patricia Plaza I, established in 1981; and Patricia Plaza II, established in 1985. These complexes are dwellings within the meaning of the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3602(b).

6. Since their development in 1981 and 1985, respectively, Patricia Plaza I and Patricia Plaza II have been designated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") as housing for persons over age 62, or "elderly persons," as that term is used in 42 U.S.C. § 1437e(a)(1). Consistent with this designation, only households whose head, co-head, spouse, or sole member is at least 62 years of age are eligible to live at Patricia Plaza I and Patricia Plaza II. The HABC's five other public housing complexes, referred to here as "General Occupancy Complexes," are open to all qualified residents, regardless of age.

II. The HABC has Discriminated Against Applicants and Residents Eligible to Live at Patricia Plaza on the Basis of Race.

7. From at least 2007 until at least 2014, the HABC has segregated the population of residents eligible to live at Patricia Plaza I or II by assigning such households to housing complexes based on race and color, rather than based on their place on the waiting list. Specifically, the HABC has disproportionately assigned White-headed households ("White households") eligible to live at Patricia Plaza to Patricia Plaza I or Patricia Plaza II, while disproportionately assigning Black-headed households ("Black households") also eligible to live at Patricia Plaza to one of the General Occupancy Complexes.

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 3 of 11 PageID #: 3

8. According to 2010 U.S. Census Bureau data, the population of Bossier City is approximately 61% White, 27% Black, 7% Hispanic, and 5% Asian, American Indian, or another racial designation.

9. At all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, the vast majority of the residents at the HABC's five General Occupancy Complexes have been Black. In 2014, for example, between approximately 90% and 98% of the population at the General Occupancy Complexes, depending on the complex, was Black. In addition, at all times relevant to this complaint, the vast majority of the Black households who reside in HABC properties have resided in one of the General Occupancy Complexes. In 2014, for example, approximately 84% of all Black HABC households lived in one of the General Occupancy Complexes.

10. By contrast, at all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, a significantly greater portion of the population at Patricia Plaza I and II has been White than is the case at the General Occupancy Complexes. In 2014, for example, approximately 44% of the population at Patricia Plaza I and II was White. In addition, at all times relevant to this Complaint, the vast majority of White households who reside in HABC properties have resided in Patricia Plaza. In 2014, approximately 90% of all White HABC households lived in Patricia Plaza I or II.

11. Analyses of occupancy data maintained by HUD from 2007 to 2014 show that among households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza, White households are being housed disproportionately at Patricia Plaza I while Black households are being housed disproportionately in the General Occupancy Complexes. The disparities are statistically significant and cannot be explained by neutral factors such as household size or eligibility to live at Patricia Plaza.

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 4 of 11 PageID #: 4

12. In 2011, Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were underrepresented at Patricia Plaza I by a difference of 18 percentage points from the occupancy rate that would be expected if the HABC were making housing assignments in a race-neutral manner. White households were overrepresented at Patricia Plaza I by a difference of 13 percentage points from what would be expected if the HABC were making housing assignments in a race-neutral manner. Similarly, White households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were underrepresented in the General Occupancy Complexes by a deviation of 35 percentage points while Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were overrepresented in the General Occupancy Complexes by a deviation of 35 percentage points while Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were overrepresented in the General Occupancy Complexes by a deviation of 35 percentage points while Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were overrepresented in the General Occupancy Complexes by a deviation of 61 percentage points.

13. Again, in 2014, Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were underrepresented at Patricia Plaza I by a difference of 18 percentage points from the occupancy rate that would be expected if the HABC were making housing assignments in a race-neutral manner. White households were overrepresented at Patricia Plaza I by a difference of 16 percentage points from what would be expected if the HABC were making housing assignments in a race-neutral manner. Similarly, White households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were underrepresented in the General Occupancy Complexes by a deviation of 32 percentage points while Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza were overrepresented in the General Occupancy Complexes by a deviation of 36 percentage points.

14. In 2014, 95% of White households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza lived at Patricia Plaza I whereas only 44% of Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza lived at Patricia Plaza I. Less than 1% of White households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza lived in the General Occupancy Complexes (1 household), whereas 54% of Black households eligible to live at Patricia Plaza lived in the General Occupancy Complexes.

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 5 of 11 PageID #: 5

15. The racial segregation described above is a direct result of the HABC's current policy and practice of assigning elderly applicants and residents, and applicants and residents otherwise qualified to live at Patricia Plaza, to particular complexes based on race and color rather than applying consistently its Admissions and Continued Placement Policy ("ACOP").

16. Adopted by the HABC, the ACOP is the policy document that governs admissions and occupancy of the public housing units administered by the HABC.

17. Among its provisions, the ACOP requires that the HABC make housing assignments from a waiting list that is maintained by bedroom size in the order in which households applied and without regard to resident preference for a particular complex or location. Instead of following the ACOP, however, the HABC has followed a practice of primarily assigning White households that are eligible to live at Patricia Plaza to Patricia Plaza I, while primarily assigning Black households also eligible to live at Patricia Plaza to units in one of the General Occupancy Complexes. To do this, the HABC selected some White applicants ahead of Black applicants for Patricia Plaza I, even though Black applicants had higher positions on the waiting list. Similarly, in filling vacancies at the General Occupancy Complexes, the HABC selected Black applicants over comparable White applicants, even though White applicants had higher positions on the waiting list. In so doing, the HABC staff followed a practice of deferring to the preferences of White households for Patricia Plaza and that Black households would prefer the General Occupancy Complexes.

18. Additionally, while the ACOP requires that the HABC maintain an HABC-wide, prioritized transfer list, the HABC has followed a practice of providing Black residents who are eligible to live at Patricia Plaza transfers primarily within the General Occupancy Complexes

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 6 of 11 PageID #: 6

while providing comparable White households transfers primarily within Patricia Plaza.

19. The HABC's discriminatory policies and practices described in this Section have harmed Black applicants and residents who are elderly or otherwise qualified to live at Patricia Plaza. The HABC has done so by: (1) skipping qualified Black applicants on the waiting list to fill vacancies at Patricia Plaza I with later-applying White applicants, thereby delaying or denying Black applicants housing; and (2) denying qualified Black applicants the opportunity to transfer to Patricia Plaza I.

III. The HABC has Discriminated Against Non-Elderly Applicants and Residents on the Basis of Disability.

20. From at least 2007 until at least 2014, the HABC has segregated its public housing population based on disability by assigning non-elderly residents with disabilities – who are qualified to live at any of the housing complexes – based on disability, rather than based on their place on the waiting list. Specifically, the HABC has assigned, in a disproportionate manner, non-elderly residents with disabilities to Patricia Plaza II and elderly residents and residents without disabilities to Patricia Plaza I and the General Occupancy Complexes. The HABC has also transferred elderly residents from Patricia Plaza II to Patricia Plaza I, further segregating non-elderly residents with disabilities at Patricia Plaza II.

21. As explained above, Patricia Plaza I and Patricia Plaza II are designated by HUD as housing for elderly persons. Consistent with that designation, Patricia Plaza I and II are open to residents who are elderly, whether or not they have a disability. In practice, however, the HABC has generally considered only elderly residents and applicants as eligible for Patricia Plaza I and only non-elderly residents and applicants with disabilities as eligible for Patricia Plaza II.

22. Analyses of occupancy data maintained by HUD from 2007 to 2014 show that

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 7 of 11 PageID #: 7

non-elderly residents with disabilities have been significantly overrepresented at Patricia Plaza II as compared to Patricia Plaza I. The overrepresentation of non-elderly residents with disabilities at Patricia Plaza II as compared to Patricia Plaza I was statistically significant and cannot be explained by neutral factors such as household size.

23. For example, if elderly residents and non-elderly residents with disabilities were assigned to Patricia Plaza I and II without non-elderly residents with disabilities being segregated at Patricia Plaza II and elderly residents at Patricia Plaza I, approximately 31% of the residents at each of the two Patricia Plaza properties would have been non-elderly residents with disabilities in 2014. However, non-elderly residents with disabilities accounted for approximately 90% of residents at Patricia Plaza II and only approximately 6% of the residents at Patricia Plaza I in that year. Non-elderly residents with disabilities were also overrepresented in Patricia Plaza II relative to one-bedroom units among the General Occupancy Complexes, as only approximately 26% of one- or two-person households without children among the General Occupancy Complexes included a non-elderly resident with a disability.

24. More generally, residents with disabilities, regardless of age, are significantly disproportionately represented at Patricia Plaza II compared to both Patricia Plaza I and the General Occupancy Complexes. In 2014, persons with disabilities accounted for approximately 87% of the residents at Patricia Plaza II but only 45% of the residents at Patricia Plaza I and approximately 54% of the one- or two-person households without children living in the General Occupancy Complexes.

25. Between 2008 and 2014, HABC filled 85 vacancies at Patricia Plaza I and 35 vacancies at Patricia Plaza II. The HABC filled only nine of the vacancies at Patricia Plaza I with non-elderly applicants with disabilities. By contrast, the HABC filled *all* of the 35

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 8 of 11 PageID #: 8

vacancies at Patricia Plaza II with non-elderly applicants with disabilities. To do so, HABC selected some elderly applicants ahead of non-elderly applicants with disabilities who had higher positions on the waiting list in order to house elderly applicants at Patricia Plaza I. Similarly, the HABC selected non-elderly applicants with disabilities over elderly applicants who had higher positions on the waiting list in order to house non-elderly applicants with disabilities at Patricia Plaza I. Plaza II.

26. The HABC skipped over non-elderly applicants with disabilities on the waiting list when filling vacancies more frequently than it skipped over other applicants. Non-elderly applicants with disabilities were skipped over an average of approximately 16 times before being assigned to a unit, whereas elderly applicants and all other applicants were skipped over an average of approximately four times before being assigned to a unit.

27. The HABC's discriminatory policies and practices described in this Section have harmed non-elderly applicants with disabilities. HABC has done so by: (1) skipping qualified non-elderly applicants with disabilities on the waiting list to fill vacancies at Patricia Plaza I and the General Occupancy Complexes with later-applying applicants without disabilities, thereby delaying or denying non-elderly applicants with disabilities housing; and (2) denying qualified non-elderly applicants with disabilities the opportunity to transfer to Patricia Plaza I.

28. The disability-based segregation described above is a direct result of the HABC's current policy and practice of selecting new residents for Patricia Plaza II on the basis of disability and transferring residents from Patricia Plaza II to Patricia Plaza I when they reach age 62. In so doing, the HABC has failed to apply consistently the HUD designation for the Patricia Plaza complexes and its ACOP. Instead, HABC staff followed a practice of deferring to the actual or perceived preferences of non-elderly applicants or residents with disabilities for Patricia

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 9 of 11 PageID #: 9

Plaza II. Staff also deferred to other residents' actual or perceived preferences for avoiding Patricia Plaza II, based on stereotypes and fears of living with persons with disabilities.

IV. The HABC's Actions Violate the Fair Housing Act.

29. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 28 are hereby realleged and incorporated by reference.

30. By engaging in the conduct described above, the defendant has:

- a) refused to rent, refused to negotiate for the rental of, and otherwise made unavailable or denied dwellings to persons because of race or color in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3604(a);
- b) discriminated against persons in the terms, conditions, or privileges of the rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith, because of race or color in violation of 42 U.S.C.
 § 3604(b);
- c) discriminated in the rental of, or otherwise made unavailable or denied, dwellings to renters because of disability, in violation of 42 U.S.C.
 § 3604(f)(1); and
- d) discriminated against persons in the terms, conditions, or privileges of the rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection with such dwelling, because of disability in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(2).
- 31. The conduct of the defendant constitutes:
 - a. A pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of rights secured by the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3601 *et seq.*; and

 A denial to a group of persons of rights granted by the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3601 *et seq.*, which denial raises an issue of general public importance.

32. Individuals who were subjected to defendant's discriminatory housing practices are aggrieved persons as defined by the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3602(i), and have suffered actual injury and damages as a result of defendant's conduct as described herein.

33. Defendant's conduct described above was intentional, willful, and/or taken with disregard for the rights of others.

WHEREFORE, the United States prays that the Court enter an order that:

A. Declares that the defendant's policies and practices, as alleged herein, violate the Fair Housing Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 3601 *et seq.*;

B. Enjoins defendant, its agents, employees and successors, and all other persons in active concert or participation with it, from:

- Discriminating on account of race, color, or disability against any person in any aspect of the rental of a dwelling; and
- (2) Discriminating in the terms, conditions, or privileges, of rental of dwellings on the basis of race, color, or disability.

C. Requires defendant to take all necessary and appropriate affirmative steps to correct the continuing effects of its past and present discriminatory practices.

D. Requires such action by the defendant as may be necessary to restore all persons aggrieved by its discriminatory housing practices to the position they would have occupied but for such discriminatory conduct.

E. Awards monetary damages to each person aggrieved by defendant's

discriminatory housing practices, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 3614(d)(1)(B).

The United States further prays for such additional relief as the interests of justice may

require.

Dated: September 30, 2016

LORETTA E. LYNCH Attorney General

STEPHANIE A. FINLEY United States Attorney

<u>s/ Karen J. King</u>

KAREN J. KING (#23508) Assistant United States Attorney 800 Lafayette Street, Suite 2200 Lafayette, Louisiana 70501 Telephone: (337) 262-6618 Facsimile: (337) 262-6693 Email: karen.king@usdoj.gov s/Vanita Gupta

VANITA GUPTA Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General Civil Rights Division

<u>s/ Sameena Shina Majeed</u>

SAMEENA SHINA MAJEED Chief Housing and Civil Enforcement Section Civil Rights Division

s/Junis L. Baldon

TIMOTHY J. MORAN Deputy Chief EMILY M. SAVNER JUNIS L. BALDON Trial Attorneys Housing and Civil Enforcement Section U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - NWB Washington, D.C. 20530 Telephone: (202) 353-4081 Facsimile: (202) 514-1116 Email: emily.savner@usdoj.gov junis.baldon@usdoj.gov

Case 5:16-cv-01376 Document 1-1 Filed 09/30/16 Page 1 of 1 PageID #: 12 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

JS 44 (Rev. 08/16)

I (a) DI AINTIEES					1	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS United States of America				DEFENDANTS Housing Authority of Bossier City, Louisiana		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Bossier Parish (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Junis L. Baldon, U.S. De Housing and Civil Enforc - NWB, Washington, D.C	partment of Justice Ci ement Section, 950 P	vil Rights Division -		400 Travis Street,	Vilkinson Carmody & G Suite 1700 101 → PH: (318) 317-1	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in (One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
	□ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)			TF DEF 1	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	□ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensk	tp of Parties in Item III)				Principal Place
				en or Subject of a 🛛 🗖 reign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	0606
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	[(Place an "X" in One Box O	ıly)			Click here for: Nature of S	
CONTRACT	1					OTHERSDADUTES
 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 			5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other		 375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 	
 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 	 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product 	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability		LABOR	830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 755 Motor Vehicle 760 Personal 10 Jury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice	 PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability 	₹TY □ 71 □ 72 □ 74 □ 75	0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation	 □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XV1 □ 865 RSI (405(g)) 	 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information
REAL PROPERTY		PRISONER PETITIO		1 Employee Retirement	FIDERAL TAX SUPPS	
 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education 	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alion Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition		Income Security Act Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Note: Internation Application Softer Immigration Actions	 B70 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 	 S96 Arbitration S99 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement				
		Remanded from [Appellate Court	□ 4 Reins Reop	stated or D 5 Transfe ened Anothe (specify)	ar District Litigatio	n - Litigation -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIC	IN Brief description of ca	nise:		o not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		g against individuals SMAND \$	on the basis of race ar CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY		JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 09/30/2016		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEYO	FRECOR		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AN	10UNT	APPLYING IFP_		JUDGE	МАС. Л	JDGE
		\bigvee			· ·	