

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**PENNSYLVANIA HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION**

**M I N U T E S**

TIME: 3:41 P.M.

Monthly Meeting

Held at

**HARRISBURG UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES TOWER**

222 Chestnut Street

Room 210B

Harrisburg, PA 17101

as well as

MICROSOFT TEAMS

August 25, 2025

1                    Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission  
2    Monthly Meeting  
3    August 25, 2025

4  
5 COMMISSIONERS:

6  
7 Joel Bolstein, Esquire, Chair  
8 Dr. Raquel O. Yiengst, Vice Chair  
9 Mayur Patel, Esquire, Secretary  
10 Dr. Rad Agrawal  
11 Michael Hardiman, Esquire  
12 Curtis Jones - Absent  
13 Aleena Sorathia, Esquire - Absent

14  
15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

16  
17 Chad Dion Lassiter, MSW

18  
19 INTERIM CHIEF COUNSEL

20  
21 Morgan Williams, Esquire

22  
23 STAFF PRESENT:

24  
25 Amanda Brothman, Director of Communications  
26 Alana Burman, Director of Policy, Intergovernmental  
27     Affairs and Mediation  
28 Desiree Chang, Director of Education  
29 Caroline Griffin, Director of Fair Housing and  
30     Commercial Property  
31 Adrian Garcia, Director of Enforcement  
32 Amber Harris, Regional Office Director, Philadelphia  
33 Darlene Martin, Esquire, Hearing Examiner  
34 Sheryl Meck, Director, Civil Rights Division  
35 La Dawn Robinson, Regional Office Director,  
36 Pittsburgh  
37 Heather Roth, Regional Office Director, Harrisburg  
38 Tamara Shehadeh-Cope, Hearing Examiner  
39 Debbie Walters, Administrative Officer  
40 Zulay Rojas, Chief of Staff

41  
42 ALSO PRESENT:

43  
44 Keith Armstrong, Fellowship Attorney, American Civil  
45     Liberties Union Pennsylvania  
46 Latrina Gordon  
47 Francis Morrison  
48 Michelle Morrison  
49 Allison Walker, Sargent's Court Reporting Service,  
50     Inc.

1 \*\*\*

2 Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission

3 August 25, 2025

4 \*\*\*

5 MEETING CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING STATEMENT

6 Joel Bolstein, Chairperson of the Pennsylvania  
7 Human Relations Commission, welcomed all to the  
8 monthly meeting of the Pennsylvania Human Relations  
9 Commission. He stated this public meeting was  
10 advertised in accordance with the provisions of the  
11 Sunshine Act. And prior to the meeting and keeping  
12 with the confidentiality requirements of the Sunshine  
13 Act, a closed session was held to discuss compliance  
14 matters, management updates, and adjudicative case  
15 deliberations.

16 After concluding with the business portion of  
17 the meeting, guests will be invited to introduce  
18 themselves and any organizations they represent.  
19 Guests will have an opportunity briefly to address  
20 the Commission. Public comments are welcomed about  
21 equal opportunity and Civil Rights issues or problems  
22 of discrimination. Any statements expressed during  
23 the Public Session by members of the public represent  
24 the opinions and beliefs of that speaker alone and  
25 not the opinions and beliefs of the Commission.





1                   Not hearing any, all those in  
2                   favor of the motion, please say aye.  
3                   Any opposed?

4 [The motion passed unanimously.]

5   \*\*\*

6 REQUESTS FOR PRELIMINARY HEARINGS

7 COMMISSIONER BOLSTEIN:

8                   We have three requests for  
9                   preliminary hearings. They are  
10                  items 5, 6 and 7.

11                  I ask if there is a motion?

12 COMMISSIONER HARDIMAN:

13                  So moved.

14 COMMISSIONER PATEL:

15                  Second.

16 CHAIR BOLSTEIN:

17                  The motion is to deny the request for  
18                  Preliminary Hearings.

19 COMMISSIONER HARDIMAN:

20                  Deny.

21 CHAIR BOLSTEIN:

22                  All right. It's been moved and  
23                  seconded to deny the request of  
24                  Preliminary Hearings at Items 5, 6 and  
25                  7 on the Agenda. Is there any

1 discussion about any of those? Not  
2 hearing any.

3 All those in favor of the motion,  
4 please say aye. Any opposed?

5 [The motion carried unanimously. Agenda Item No. 5  
6 is Case No. 202201138. Agenda Item No. 6 is Case No.  
7 202201526. Agenda Item No. 7 is Case No. 202401946.]

8 \*\*\*

9 MOTIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS

10 [Joel Bolstein, Esquire, Chair, noted the Commission  
11 had a final guidance to vote on, Pennsylvania Human  
12 Relations Commission Harassment in Educational  
13 Settings: Guidance on Evaluating Claims of Bullying  
14 and Harassment under the Pennsylvania Human Relations  
15 Act 2025. Chair Bolstein noted the guidance clearly  
16 stated it was not intended to impose hard and fast  
17 rules to be applied in every circumstance. He also  
18 noted the guidance shall not affect any statutory or  
19 regulatory requirements.]

20 \*\*\*

21 CHAIR BOLSTEIN:

22 Is there a motion to approve this final  
23 guidance?

24 COMMISSIONER YIENGST:

25 So moved.

1 COMMISSIONER HARDIMAN:

2                   Second.

3 CHAIR BOLSTEIN:

4                   It's been moved by Commissioner  
5                   Yiengst, seconded by Commissioner  
6                   Hardiman. Is there any discussion  
7                   about the guidance? Not hearing any.

8                   All those in favor of the motion,  
9                   please say aye. Any opposed?

10 [The motion carried unanimously.]

11   \*\*\*

12 [Joel Bolstein, Esquire, Chair, stated the Commission  
13 had a proposed guidance to vote on, Pennsylvania  
14 Human Relations Commission Personal Care Assistance  
15 Guidance on Certain Reasonable Accommodations Under  
16 the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act. He noted the  
17 guidance does not have the force of law and does not  
18 change any statutory or regulatory requirements. He  
19 added the guidance will go out for public comment.  
20 He explained the guidance is for Michael's Law which  
21 allows somebody with a disability to go into a public  
22 venue with a personal care assistant and the venue  
23 owner or operator has to accommodate for the  
24 assistant.]

25   \*\*\*

1 CHAIR BOLSTEIN:

2                   Is there a motion to approve the  
3                   proposed guidance and release it for  
4                   public comment?

5 COMMISSIONER YIENGST:

6                   So moved.

7 COMMISSIONER HARDIMAN:

8                   Second.

9 CHAIR BOLSTEIN:

10                   Any discussion on this proposed  
11                   guidance? Not hearing any.

12                   All in favor of the proposed  
13                   guidance, please say aye. Any opposed?

14 [The motion carried unanimously.]

15                   \*\*\*

16 [Chad Dion Lassiter, MSW, Executive Director, asked  
17 the guests at the meeting to introduce themselves.]

18                   \*\*\*

19 MANAGEMENT REPORTS - DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATION

20 [Amanda Brothman, Director of Communications, noted a  
21 number of upcoming events in September and October.

22 She encouraged people to look at PHRC's website,  
23 pa.gov/agencies/phrc, for more information.]

24                   \*\*\*

25 MANAGEMENT REPORTS - DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

1 [Desiree Chang, Director of Education, noted the  
2 Bullying and Harassment Guidance just passed would be  
3 included in ELCPA's Back to School guide in  
4 September.]

5

\*\*\*

6 MANAGEMENT REPORT - DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND  
7 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

8 [Alana Burman, Director of Policy, Intergovernmental  
9 Affairs and Mediation, reported her office would be  
10 promulgating dates and the Personal Care Assistance  
11 Guidance for public comments in the coming months.]

12

\*\*\*

13 MANAGEMENT REPORTS - DIRECTOR OF FAIR HOUSING AND  
14 COMMERCIAL PROPERTY

15 [Caroline Griffin, Director of Fair Housing and  
16 Commercial Property, noted there would be sexual  
17 harassment and housing training on August 27, 2025.]

18

\*\*\*

19 MANAGEMENT REPORTS - DIRECTOR OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND  
20 OUTREACH DIVISION

21 [Sheryl Meck, Supervisor, Civil Rights Division,  
22 noted the Civil Rights Division would be in a number  
23 of different outreach events across the state. She  
24 added information regarding events could be found on  
25 PHRC's website.]

1 \*\*\*

2 OLD BUSINESS - NONE.

3 \*\*\*

4 NEW BUSINESS - NONE.

5 \*\*\*

6 PUBLIC COMMENT

7 [Frances Morrison stated he first became aware of  
8 PHRC in 1968 as part of the Community Action Training  
9 School (CATS), an original outreach group in  
10 Pennsylvania. His group was the first group PHRC  
11 visited and explained what discrimination was. He  
12 reported CATS had so many people come to them with  
13 housing and employment discrimination, they found it  
14 necessary to have a two-hour instructional period on  
15 how and what is to be done. He noted documentation  
16 is important.

17 Mr. Morrison commented at a recent meeting  
18 regarding outreach workers from different counties,  
19 the question was asked about what people see in the  
20 word community. He shared he sees common unity just  
21 as he sees common wealth when looking at the  
22 Commonwealth. He added the state's wealth lies in  
23 its people. He also noted the residents need to be  
24 respectful.

25 Mr. Morrison stated, on August 8, 2024, he went

1 online to fill out a PHRC contact form. Shortly  
2 thereafter, he received an email stating contact was  
3 received by PHRC. He downloaded the PHRC Housing  
4 Complaint Form revised 9-2020 due to the number of  
5 individuals involved in potentially multiple cases.  
6 He emailed the Harrisburg Regional Director  
7 requesting permission to use the form. He noted the  
8 response received was "It is my understanding you  
9 have already submitted a complaint to our intake  
10 department. They will be in contact if they need any  
11 further information. Thanks."

12 Mr. Morrison stated the response left him  
13 feeling perplexed, exasperated and hastily dismissed.  
14 He noted it would have been pointless for him to ask  
15 about the form if the complaints had already been  
16 filed. A subsequent apology explained his name had  
17 been confused with another person's name. He  
18 wondered if this was the result of cultural bias or a  
19 lack of critical thinking.

20 He noted another incident in which an individual  
21 in his group was sent a form to fill out because of  
22 retaliation. However, four other people from his  
23 group did not receive any feedback or information  
24 when they initiated contact with PHRC regarding  
25 retaliation for filing a discrimination complaint.

1 He stated policies and procedures are only effective  
2 up to a point where they become outdated and are no  
3 longer feasible.

4 Mr. Morrison took note of the diversity of PHRC.  
5 He added a brief explanation of the "T" in  
6 Pennsylvania between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. He  
7 stated, during World War I, individuals from the  
8 Southern states were brought up to work in the coal  
9 mines and those people maintained an ideology from  
10 the South. He believes the ideology from their  
11 culture has infiltrated all organizations in the  
12 Commonwealth. He added a belief the infiltration  
13 will work to subvert the mission of PHRC.

14 Chair Bolstein thanked Mr. Morrison for his  
15 comments and feedback on his experiences with PHRC.  
16 He recognized Mr. Morrison's comments regarding the  
17 demographics in the Commonwealth, noting they deal  
18 with it themselves as the Commission. He also noted  
19 there are four vacancies at the Commission which they  
20 have had trouble filling. He shared the  
21 Commissioners today have worked at PHRC for a long  
22 time and worked with former executive director, Homer  
23 Floyd.

24 Mr. Morrison remembered Mr. Floyd as well as  
25 Kyle Bronson. He stated he can speak about the

1 effectiveness of PHRC under Mr. Floyd and Mr.  
2 Bronson. He noted a change from the PHRC under them  
3 compared to the PHRC now.

4 Chair Bolstein noted when Mr. Floyd and Mr.  
5 Brunson were with PHRC, there were 220 paid  
6 professional staff while today there are 92 staff  
7 members. Meanwhile the number of complaints has not  
8 gone down, so timely addressing matters has gotten  
9 harder with fewer people. He added PHRC does the  
10 best it can with its resources, but it is not  
11 perfect. He noted improvements can always be made,  
12 and PHRC is constantly reevaluating procedures and  
13 policies. He added his appreciation for Mr. Floyd's  
14 perspective.]

15 \*\*\*

16 Public Comment

17 [Latrina Gordon introduced herself and stated she was  
18 originally from Ohio but had come to Pennsylvania due  
19 to the military and had stayed after her service.  
20 She added, due to the discrimination she experienced  
21 in Pennsylvania, she was moving back to Ohio.

22 Ms. Gordon explained she understands the lack of  
23 resources at PHRC and the caseload. She had an issue  
24 with how her particular case was handled. She noted,  
25 after her experience with PHRC, she suggested the

1 PHRC lacks a human element. She relayed, after  
2 filing her intake form, she was assigned an  
3 investigator, but the investigator did not speak to  
4 her for a full year. When she emailed the  
5 investigator, she was told her case was from 2022,  
6 and they were still working on 2020.

7 She shared her experience in Mechanicsburg,  
8 particularly the West Shore. She had never  
9 experienced subtle microaggressions like what she  
10 experienced there. She lives in a neighborhood in  
11 which the KKK put out pamphlets in 2019.

12 She returned to her case and noted the  
13 investigator never asked her any questions. Her case  
14 was then reassigned to a second investigator who did  
15 the same. She felt, when it came to the process at  
16 PHRC, she was treated as a burden and no one wanted  
17 to hear her case. She added, as retired military, if  
18 there is a limited amount of resources, PHRC should  
19 still find a way to make it work.

20 Ms. Gordon stated no one should go through  
21 discrimination in this day and age due to  
22 complacency. She explained the lack of a human aspect  
23 in how PHRC treated her case made her feel as if she  
24 did not matter, which is hurtful.

25 Ms. Gordon suggested she had been in an assembly

1 line as there was no humanity in what she experienced  
2 with the process her case took. She stated, if  
3 there is a lack of resources, PHRC needs to look at  
4 how to offset the problem. She also noted she would  
5 take words of wisdom from the Commission, but at a  
6 certain point, policies need to be looked at for  
7 solutions.

8 Mr. Lassiter stated he is not the kind of person  
9 to placate, ingratiate or displace false generosity.  
10 He added appreciation for Mr. Morrison and Ms. Gordon  
11 in fighting through the paralysis of silence to speak  
12 at the meeting. He added it was great that they  
13 critiqued and criticized PHRC. He noted PHRC wants  
14 to do better and has tried to see the humanity in  
15 each person and not just a number.

16 Mr. Lassiter stated PHRC is charged with  
17 protecting the rights of 13 million, and it does so  
18 to the best of its ability while experiencing racial  
19 trauma and racial fatigue. He added the experiences  
20 PHRC staff experience does not negate the humanity of  
21 Ms. Gordon. He further added every senior manager at  
22 PHRC recognizes they need to do a better job with  
23 quality assurance and customer service. He mentioned  
24 the PHRC brings in people to do anti-bias and anti-  
25 racism training. He recognized investigative

1 practices can be improved upon.

2 Mr. Lassiter was impressed with all of the  
3 previous work during the Homer Floyd time period. He  
4 stated the work of the current Commission is  
5 unprecedented, especially with the initiatives they  
6 have created. He acknowledged PHRC still falls short  
7 with procedural matters.

8 Mr. Lassiter asked Mr. Morrison what he thought  
9 of PHRC and where they are as an agency over time.  
10 Mr. Morrison stated everything is cyclical. He noted  
11 the cycle of overt racism and overt discrimination  
12 back in 2016. He stated there needed to be an  
13 examination of how structural racism exists and what  
14 perpetuates it including the culture of  
15 noncompliance.]

16 \*\*\*

17 [Keith Armstrong, Fellowship Attorney, American Civil  
18 Liberties Union Pennsylvania (ACLU-PA) gave a  
19 presentation entitled ICE-y Road Ahead: Recent  
20 Trends in Immigration Enforcement in Pennsylvania.  
21 He noted there is an increase in immigration  
22 enforcement both in Pennsylvania and across the  
23 country, a trend which will continue for the  
24 foreseeable future.

25 Mr. Armstrong stated ACLU-PA's immigrants'

1 rights work involves not just legal work but also  
2 advocacy, policy and communications. Part of the  
3 work is telling the stories of clients who have had  
4 their civil rights and civil liberties violated. He  
5 added, since the 2024 election, there has been a  
6 focus on knowing your rights and working with various  
7 committee coalitions to try to get towns and counties  
8 to pass welcoming or Fourth Amendment protected  
9 policies.

10 Mr. Armstrong explained ACLU, in partnership  
11 with their coalition members, have been moving away  
12 from using the term sanctuary cities, which has been  
13 weaponized by people who are opposed to policies  
14 connected to non-citizens. He also noted the term  
15 sanctuary city can be confusing among the people who  
16 are meant to be protected by welcoming policies. ICE  
17 is federally mandated to conduct enforcement  
18 activities anywhere in the continental United States.  
19 By rebranding to welcoming or Fourth Amendment  
20 policies, it allows cities, towns and counties to  
21 operate their cooperation with ICE by treating IE  
22 like any other law enforcement agency with regards to  
23 their Fourth Amendment obligations. This requires  
24 ICE to have a signed judicial warrant instead of an  
25 administrative warrant. It also requires ICE to

1 subpoena records about a person instead of the local  
2 agencies just sharing the records which is in line  
3 with the Fourth Amendment, prohibiting unlawful  
4 search and seizures.

5       ACLU-PA has been doing transparency work which  
6 includes requests and subsequent litigation under the  
7 Freedom of Information Act and Pennsylvania's Right-  
8 to-Know law. Much of the work is geared toward  
9 learning about conditions of immigration detention  
10 facilities in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is home to  
11 the largest immigration detention center in the  
12 northeastern United States, Moshannon Valley  
13 Processing Center. He noted, as ICE detention  
14 expands, larger centers will likely be built  
15 elsewhere. He added ACLU-PA is creating a record of  
16 what is happening at Moshannon Valley. In the four  
17 years since the facility opened, there have been two  
18 deaths, a number of overdoses and serious issues with  
19 medical care. Mr. Armstrong noted ACLU has three  
20 active lawsuits against ICE to obtain facility  
21 records and a pending fourth lawsuit.

22       Mr. Armstrong explained ACLU-PA is also  
23 challenging unlawful practices in immigration  
24 enforcement and ICE detention. He noted ACLU-PA  
25 cannot take on every habeas corpus lawsuit, but tries

1 to take on cases which illustrate broader trends in  
2 what is happening in immigration enforcement. One of  
3 the current habeas cases relates to the issue of  
4 people being arrested after their immigration court  
5 hearings, which has become a much more common  
6 practice. By bringing the case, the ACLU-PA can  
7 illustrate not just what is happening with the  
8 practice but also build precedent to help people who  
9 have been arrested under the policies. He also noted  
10 a case related to the unlawful detention of person  
11 who had a valid temporary protected status in the  
12 United States that ICE unilaterally revoked, despite  
13 not being the agency allowed to do so.

14 Mr. Armstrong noted ACLU-PA is also working on  
15 cases regarding how law enforcement agencies in  
16 Pennsylvania are cooperating with ICE. He stated  
17 there is an active case challenging the 287(g)  
18 agreement between the Bucks County Sheriff and ICE.  
19 287(g) agreements are agreements between local law  
20 enforcement agencies and ICE, allowing ICE to  
21 deputize members of the law enforcement agencies to  
22 conduct arrests for ICE as well as other federal law  
23 enforcement tasks. He added there were zero active  
24 287(g) agreements in Pennsylvania in January 2025.  
25 There are now 29 with several pending.

1           He stated ACLU-PA is also part of a network of  
2 organizations doing rapid response work in the midst  
3 of ICE raids.

4           Mr. Armstrong presented five examples of ICE  
5 raids in Pennsylvania which have led to multiple  
6 arrests. He noted, in some cases there is a pattern  
7 of ICE claiming they are examining worksite  
8 exploitation and employers violating the rights of  
9 workers. However, the only arrests made in the  
10 situations are workers. ACLU-PA has filed a FOIA to  
11 gather information regarding ICE's actual purpose in  
12 those raids as the reason given seems pretextual. In  
13 another case, a large-scale arrest operation occurred  
14 in Norristown in which 14 employees and customers of  
15 a grocery store were arrested. He shared the  
16 Norristown case showed clear cooperation between ICE  
17 and the local police department.

18           Mr. Armstrong stated another problematic  
19 behavior is when local police departments pull over  
20 cars for various reasons and then instantly call in  
21 ICE. The behavior ends up leading to racial  
22 discrimination and ethnic profiling.

23           The most recent case ACLU-PA is reviewing from  
24 mid-August shows possible involvement with the  
25 Pennsylvania State Police (PSP). He noted the

1 problematic nature of the possibility as a lawsuit  
2 was settled in 2022 regarding PSP cooperation with  
3 ICE.

4 Mr. Armstrong noted ICE often arrests people at  
5 ICE check-ins as well as people at immigration  
6 hearings. He added ICE conducts small-scale  
7 operations in immigrant communities.

8 He reported, based on statistics, ICE activities  
9 have increased in Pennsylvania. In 2024, there were  
10 between 1,400 and 1,800 arrests in Pennsylvania.  
11 From January 2025 to July 2025, there have been 3,000  
12 to 3,400 arrests, showing a dramatic increase. More  
13 than half of the people arrested have no criminal  
14 record.

15 Mr. Armstrong explained the matters are  
16 systematically tracked but not much data has been  
17 gathered for the second Trump administration as it is  
18 relatively early on. ACLU-PA obtained I-213 forms  
19 from ICE for the more than 16,000 people arrested by  
20 ICE in Pennsylvania from 2016-2020. The forms are  
21 not exhaustive of every arrest but are representative  
22 of ICE's patterns. I-213 forms document the arrests  
23 and form the basis for a person's immigration case.  
24 The information on I-213 can include why the arrest  
25 was conducted, where it happened, and a description

1 of the person. I-213 forms generally provide the  
2 legal basis for placing a person into deportation  
3 proceedings.

4 Data gathered from the forms showed that ICE  
5 primarily targeted Latin American men of color  
6 working in low wage opportunities with 58 percent of  
7 people arrested falling into that category. The I-  
8 213 forms also track the identified complexion of the  
9 person with suggestions of light, medium and dark  
10 complexions. 47 percent of records indicate a person  
11 with a medium complexion, 17 percent indicate a  
12 medium brown complexion and 10 percent indicate a  
13 light brown complexion. Mr. Armstrong explained this  
14 shows the majority of people targeted by ICE arrests  
15 are people of color.

16 The median age of people targeted is 32 meaning  
17 the people are of working age and likely trying to  
18 support families both in the United States and  
19 abroad. Most of the occupations fall into labor,  
20 construction, and cooks showing ICE is targeting  
21 workers in low wage or informal positions. By  
22 targeting these positions, it contributes to possible  
23 exploitation of workers as they become afraid to  
24 report workplace abuse.

25 32 of the arrests were of people who entered the

1 United States on H-2A guest worker visas. Workers on  
2 H-2A visas are dependent on employers to maintain  
3 their immigration status which means they cannot  
4 leave their job without risking their immigration  
5 status. He noted there are a number of ways the  
6 immigration system creates positions where people are  
7 marginalized and then targeted for removal.

8 Mr. Armstrong reported there is a regular  
9 pattern of ICE separating families. 27 percent of  
10 arrests during the first Trump term separated parents  
11 from children. At least 65 arrests involving family  
12 separation happened at ICE check-in appointments at  
13 which ICE argues the parent and child entered at  
14 separate instances and therefore have separate  
15 immigration cases without having any information to  
16 back up their claims.

17 Mr. Armstrong stated ACLU has identified two  
18 main buckets of ICE arrest tactics. The first bucket  
19 is the arrests in the community often with local law  
20 enforcement assistance. The second bucket is arrests  
21 which happen while a person is in custody. Custodial  
22 arrests occur when a person has an ICE detainer  
23 issued for them, but they would otherwise be released  
24 on parole or permanently released from jail. It also  
25 includes arrests of people already in criminal

1 custody or at a parole check-in.

2 Mr. Armstrong focused on ICE arrests in the  
3 community. He noted the most common method ICE  
4 engages in community arrest is through car stops.  
5 ICE does not have the power to pull over a car the  
6 same way that local police can with traffic  
7 violations. ICE is only permitted to pull over a car  
8 if they have reasonable suspicion a person is  
9 removable from the United States or otherwise in  
10 violation of immigration laws. He noted the pattern  
11 ACLU has untangled is that ICE will observe someone  
12 at their house that they suspect to be undocumented.  
13 After the person gets into their car and picks up a  
14 few people, ICE will pull over the car. 25 percent  
15 of ICE arrests in the community are collateral  
16 arrests where they are not arresting the person  
17 targeted but the people around them. ICE also stops  
18 vehicles and claims to be looking for a particular  
19 person. Even if the person is not in the car, ICE  
20 interrogates everyone. This is problematic as ICE  
21 does not have reasonable suspicion the people are in  
22 violation of immigration law.

23 Mr. Armstrong reported ICE tries to get around  
24 the problem by claiming on I-213 forms that people  
25 voluntarily told ICE about their immigration status.

1 19 percent of community arrests isolated on I-213  
2 forms state the person freely, voluntarily or  
3 consensually shared they did not have a valid  
4 immigrations status. Mr. Armstrong noted many times  
5 the people are confronted with multiple ICE vehicles  
6 and agents with weapons so the question of voluntary  
7 admission is a valid one. He added the issue is  
8 compounded by very little language access as many  
9 times if a person has an interpreter on scene, it is  
10 often someone who just happened to be there. This  
11 undercuts the ability of a person to even understand  
12 if they are consenting willingly to ICE  
13 interrogation.

14 Mr. Armstrong reported the second bucket of ICE  
15 arrests often requires some degree of entanglement  
16 with state and local law enforcement. At the state  
17 level, ACLU-PA represented a number of people who had  
18 been stopped by PSP and alleged racial profiling.  
19 The lawsuit with PSP was settle in 2022. As part of  
20 the settlement, PSP adopted a policy stating they  
21 could not stop, search or detain a person based on  
22 immigration status, citizenship or nationality. They  
23 are also forbidden from asking any person about their  
24 immigration status and are forbidden from prolonging  
25 a traffic stop to call ICE.

1           Mr. Armstrong stated at the local and county  
2 levels there are a number of ways local governments  
3 can cooperate with ICE but there are ways to limit  
4 the cooperation. County municipalities can adopt  
5 policies which limit the acceptance of ICE detainers  
6 and 287(g) agreements as well as prevent the leasing  
7 of space for ICE detention facilities. ACLU-PA is  
8 part of a statewide coalition actively advocating for  
9 local governments to adopt welcoming polices which  
10 limit cooperation with ICE.

11           Mr. Armstrong noted another way for local law  
12 enforcement to be entangled with ICE is honoring ICE  
13 detainers. He added the law is clear on ICE  
14 detainers based on a couple of ACLU cases from about  
15 10 years ago. The decision from *Galarza v. Szalczyk*  
16 2024 led to a settlement of Lehigh County no longer  
17 honoring ICE detainers. The Third Circuit also held  
18 when a local law enforcement agency or jail decided  
19 to hold someone on an ICE detainer, it is a separate  
20 arrest needing separate probable cause. If ICE is  
21 incorrect and the person is not removable, the county  
22 can be held liable for honoring an improper ICE  
23 detainer. Under the current administration, ICE has  
24 been reaching out to counties to get them to  
25 reconsider their policies regarding ICE detainers.

1 He added ACLU-PA has reminded all Pennsylvania  
2 counties of the prior two cases and reminding them  
3 ACLU-PA is ready to sue when someone is held  
4 unlawfully on an ICE detainer.

5 Mr. Armstrong stated 287(g) agreement inherently  
6 has problems. One of which is the resources are  
7 diverted from local communities. ICE is forbidden  
8 under federal statute authorizing 287(g) agreements  
9 from compensating local law enforcement for their  
10 time. 287(g) agreements also erode trust between  
11 local law enforcement and immigrant communities which  
12 undermines public safety. 287(g) agreements can also  
13 open the door to racial profiling and other civil  
14 rights violations.

15 Mr. Armstrong mentioned the 287(g) agreement  
16 between ICE and Sheriff Fred Harran of Bucks County.  
17 The agreement was entered into without the county  
18 commissioner's approval. Under Pennsylvania law,  
19 commissioners must approve of any intergovernmental  
20 agreements with the federal government. Once the  
21 commissioners in Bucks County learned of the 287(g)  
22 agreement, a resolution was passed disavowing the  
23 agreement and stated it would not defer any financial  
24 resources to support the agreement. ACLU-PA has  
25 filed a lawsuit, because the sheriff has not backed

1 down from the agreement. He added there is a  
2 preliminary injunction hearing in Bucks County court  
3 on September 16, 2025 regarding the lawsuit.

4 Chair Bolstein thanked Mr. Armstrong and ACLU-PA  
5 for its important work. Mr. Armstrong noted ACLU-PA  
6 will likely have cases to refer to PHRC.]

7 \*\*\*

8 ADJOURNMENT

9 CHAIR BOLSTEIN:

10 With that will wrap it up. It's just me  
11 and Commissioner Patel, so motion to  
12 adjourn.

13 [The motion passed unanimously.]

14 \*\*\*

15 [The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting  
16 date is September 22, 2025.]

17 \*\*\*

18

19 CERTIFICATE

20

21 I hereby certify that the foregoing summary  
22 minutes of the Pennsylvania Human Relations  
23 Commission, was reduced to writing by me or under my  
24 supervision, and that the minutes accurately  
25 summarize the substance of the Pennsylvania Human

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

Relations Commission meeting.



Allison Walker,  
Minute Clerk  
Sargent's Court Reporting  
Service, Inc.



-----

M. Joel Bolstein, Chairman



-----

o/b/o Commissioner Mayur Patel

Mayur Patel, Secretary