



COLORADO

Department of
Regulatory Agencies

Colorado Civil Rights Division

1560 Broadway Street, Suite 1050
Denver, CO 80202

Charge No. P20140069X

William Jack
4987 E. Barrington Ave.
Castle Rock, CO 80104

Charging Party

Azucar Bakery
1886 S. Broadway
Denver, CO 80210

Respondent

DETERMINATION

Under the authority vested in me by C.R.S. 24-34-306 (2), I conclude from our investigation that there is insufficient evidence to support the Charging Party’s claims of unequal treatment and denial of goods or services based on creed. As such, a **No Probable Cause** determination hereby is issued.

7

The Division finds that the Respondent did not discriminate based on the Charging Party’s creed. Instead, the evidence reflects that the Respondent declined to make the Charging Party’s cakes, as he had envisioned them, because he requested the cakes include derogatory language and imagery. The evidence demonstrates that the Respondent would deny such requests to any customer, regardless of creed.

The Respondent is a place of public accommodation within the meaning of C.R.S. 24-34-601 (1), as re-enacted, and the timeliness and all other jurisdictional requirements pursuant to Title 24, Article 34, Parts 3 and 6 have been met.

The Charging Party alleges that on or about March 13, 2014, he was treated unequally and denied goods or services in a place of public accommodation based on his creed, Christianity. The Respondent denies the allegations of discrimination and avers that the requested cake by the Charging Party was denied solely on the basis that the writing and imagery were “hateful and offensive”.

The legal framework under which civil rights matters are examined is as follows: The initial burden of proof rests on the Charging Party to prove his/her case. Each key or essential element (“prima facie”) of the particular claim must be proven, through a majority (“preponderance”) of the evidence. If the Charging Party meets this initial burden of proof,



then the Respondent has the next burden of explaining, with sufficient clarity, a business justification for the action taken. This is in response to the specific alleged action named in the charge. In addition, the Respondent has the burden of production of sufficient documents and other information requested by the administrative agency during the civil rights investigation. If the Respondent offers a legitimate business reason, then the burden once again shifts back to the Charging Party to prove that this proffered legitimate business reason is a pretext for discrimination. At this stage, the Charging Party must prove, again through sufficient evidence, that the true and primary motive for the Respondent's actions is unlawful discrimination.

"Unlawful discrimination" means that which is primarily based on the Charging Party's asserted protected group or status. The Respondent's stated reasons for its actions are presumed to be true, unless and until the Charging Party, again through competent evidence found in this investigation, adequately shows that the Respondent's reason is pretext; is not to be believed; and that the Charging Party's protected status was the main reason for the adverse action taken by the Respondent. The Charging Party does not need to submit additional evidence, in response to the Respondent's position, but the available evidence must be legally sufficient so that a reasonable person would find that the Respondent intended to discriminate against the Charging Party because of his/her protected civil rights status. Colorado Civil Rights Commission v. Big O Tires, Inc., 940 P.2d 397 (Colo. 1997), and Ahmad Bodaghi and State Board of Personnel, State of Colorado v. Department of Natural Resources, 995 P.2d 288 (Colo. 2000).

The Respondent is a bakery operating within the State of Colorado.

The Charging Party visited the Respondent's store on or about March 13, 2014, and was met by Pastry Chef Lindsay Jones ("Jones") (Christian). The Charging Party asked Jones for a price quote on two cakes made in the shape of open Bibles. The Charging Party requested that one of the cakes include an image of two groomsmen, holding hands in front of a cross, with a red "X" over the image. The Charging Party also requested that each cake be decorated with Biblical verses. On one of the cakes, he requested that one side read "God hates sin. Psalm 45:7" and on the opposite side of the cake "Homosexuality is a detestable sin. Leviticus 18:2." On the second cake, which he requested include the image of the two groomsmen with a red "X" over them, the Charging Party requested that it read: "God loves sinners," and on the other side "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Romans 5:8." The Charging Party did not state that the cakes were intended for a specific purpose or event.

After receiving the Charging Party's order, Jones excused herself from the counter and discussed the order with Owner Marjorie Silva ("Silva") (Catholic) and Manager Michael Bordo ("Bordo") (Catholic). Silva came to the counter to speak with the Charging Party. Silva asked the Charging Party about his general cake request and the Charging Party explained that he wanted two cakes made to look like Bibles. The Charging Party then explained to Silva that he wanted the verses as referenced above to appear on the cakes.

Silva states that she does not recall the specific verses that the Charging Party requested, but recalls the words "detestable," "homosexuality," and "sinners." The parties dispute what occurred next. The Charging Party alleges that Silva told him that she would have to consult with an attorney to determine the legality of decorating a cake with words that she felt were discriminatory. Silva denies that she told the Charging Party that she needed to consult with

an attorney, and states that she informed the Charging Party that she would make him cakes in the shape of Bibles, but would not decorate them with the message that he requested. Silva states that she declined to decorate the cakes with the verses or image of the groomsmen and offered instead provide him with icing and a pastry bag so he could write or draw whatever message he wished on the cakes himself. Silva also avers that she told the Charging Party that her bakery “does not discriminate” and “accept[s] all humans.”

Later that day, the Charging Party returned to the bakery to inquire if Silva was still declining to make the cakes as requested. Bordo states that he reiterated the bakery would bake the cakes, but would not decorate them with the requested Biblical verses or groomsmen. The Charging Party asked Bordo if “he consider[ed] not baking [his] cake discrimination against [him] as a Christian,” to which Bordo responded “no.” The Charging Party then left the bakery.

The Charging Party maintains that he did not ask the Respondent or its employees to agree with or endorse the message of his envisioned cakes.

The Respondent avers that the Charging Party’s request was not accommodated because it deemed the design and verses as discriminatory to the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community. The Respondent further states that “in the same manner [it] would not accept [an order from] anyone wanting to make a discriminatory cake against Christians, [it] will not make one that discriminates against gays.” The Respondent states that it welcomes all customers, including the Charging Party, regardless of their protected class.

The evidence demonstrates that the Respondent specializes in cakes for various occasions, including weddings, birthdays, holidays, and other celebrations. On the Respondent’s website, there are images of cakes created for customers in the past. There are numerous cakes decorated with Christian symbols and writing. Specifically, in the category of “Baby Shower and Christening Cakes” there are images of three cakes depicting the Christian cross, two of which include the words “God Bless” and one inscribed with “Mi Bautizo” (Spanish for “my baptism”). There is also an image of a wedding cake created by the Respondent depicting an opposite sex couple embracing in front of a Christian cross. The Respondent’s website also provides that the bakery will make cakes “for every season of the year,” including the Christian holidays of Easter and Christmas.

The Respondent states that it has previously denied cake requests due to business constraints, such as inability to meet customer deadlines due to high demand, but maintains that it would deny any requests deemed “offensive” or “hateful.”

Comparative data reflects that the Respondent employs six persons, of whom three are Catholic and three are non-Catholic Christian. The record reflects that, in an average year, the Respondent produces between 60 and 80 cakes with Christian themes and/or symbolism.

Unequal Treatment

To prevail on a claim of discriminatory denial of equal treatment, the evidence must show that: (1) the Charging Party is a member of a protected class; (2) the Charging Party sought the goods and services of the Respondent; (3) the Charging Party is otherwise a qualified

recipient of the goods and services of the Respondent; and (4) the Charging Party was treated differently by the Respondent than other individuals not of his/her protected class.

The Charging Party is a member of a protected class based on his creed, Christianity. The Charging Party was a qualified recipient of the goods and services of the Respondent. The Charging Party sought to order two cakes from the Respondent bearing Biblical verses and imagery indicating that same-sex marriage is, in his words “un-Biblical and inappropriate.” The Charging Party alleges that the Respondent treated him differently than persons of non-Christian creed by “demeaning his beliefs.” There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate the Respondent treated the Charging Party differently than customers outside of his protected class.

Denial of Service

To prevail on a claim of discriminatory denial of goods, services, benefits, or privileges, the evidence must show that: (1) the Charging Party is a member of a protected class (2) the Charging Party sought services or goods from the Respondent; (3) the Charging party is otherwise a qualified recipient of the goods and services of the Respondent; (4) the Charging Party was denied services or goods by the Respondent; (5) under circumstances that give rise to an inference of unlawful discrimination based on a protected class.

The Charging Party is a member of a protected class based on his creed, Christianity. The Respondent was a qualified recipient of the goods and services of the Respondent. The Charging Party sought to order two cakes from the Respondent bearing Biblical verses and imagery indicating that same-sex marriage is, in his words “un-Biblical and inappropriate.” The Respondent denied the Charging Party’s request to make cakes that included the Biblical verses and an image of groomsmen with a red “X” over them. The circumstances do not give rise to an inference that the Respondent denied the Charging Party goods or services based on his creed. Indeed, the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent would have made a cake for the Charging Party for any event, celebration, or occasion regardless of his creed. Instead, the Respondent’s denial was based on the explicit message that the Charging Party wished to include on the cakes, which the Respondent deemed as discriminatory. Additionally, the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent regularly creates cakes with Christian themes and/or symbolism, which are presumably ordered by Christian customers. Finally, the Respondent avers that it would similarly deny a request from a customer who requested a cake that it deemed discriminatory towards Christians.

Based on the evidence contained above, I determine that the Respondent has not violated C.R.S. 24-34-601(2), as re-enacted.


In accordance with C.R.S. 24-34-306(2)(b)(I)(A) and Rule 10.6(A)(1) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Charging Party may appeal the dismissal of this case to the Commission within ten (10) days, as set forth in the enclosed form.


If the Charging Party wishes to file a civil action in a district court in this state, which action is based on the alleged discriminatory or unfair practice that was the subject of the charge filed with the Commission, such must be done:

- a. Within ninety days of the mailing of this notice if no appeal is filed with the Colorado Civil Rights Commission or
- b. Within ninety days of the mailing of the final notice of the Commission dismissing the appeal.

If Charging Party does not file an action within the time limits specified above, such action will be barred and no State District Court shall have jurisdiction to hear such action [CRS 24-34-306(l)].

On Behalf of the Colorado Civil Rights Division


Jennifer McPherson, Interim Director
Or Authorized Designee


Date