

PRESS RELEASE

Mr. LeHouillier resolved a claim brought by the United States for economic reasons. In 2005 through 2007, Mr. LeHouillier defended his friends in a dispute with a veterinarian named Joan Murnane in El Paso County District Court, State of Colorado. The litigation was contentious. In the litigation, Dr. Murnane sought veterinarian fees while at the same time representing to her insurance company that she was totally disabled. A deposition of Dr. Murnane's company was scheduled for December of 2006. Dr. Murnane's attorney informed Mr. LeHouillier that Dr. Murnane intended to bring a dog with her as a service animal. Mr. LeHouillier had reasons to believe that the animal had not been trained as a service animal. Mr. LeHouillier indicated that the animal would be allowed to be present for the deposition if documentation was provided confirming that the dog was in fact a service animal. No documentation was provided. As such, Mr. LeHouillier did not allow the animal in his office. The deposition was taken at the office of Dr. Murnane's attorney that same day.

In September of 2007, Mr. LeHouillier was notified of a complaint made to the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Section. In November 2007, El Paso County District Court determined that Dr. Murnane would not collect any of the veterinarian fees she sought in the underlying litigation. Two years later, in November of 2009, the United States filed a civil complaint against Mr. LeHouillier. The government took the position that if a disabled person claimed his or her pet was a service animal, a business must allow the animal into the business.

Throughout the lawsuit brought by the United States, Mr. LeHouillier denied he violated the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"). In the Consent Decree, Mr. LeHouillier specifically denied he violated the ADA and continues to believe that the government's position was erroneous. Unfortunately, the expense involved in defending against the ADA claim would have easily surpassed the monetary demand made by the government. The resources available to the government would have forced Mr. LeHouillier to incur substantial expenses in defending the claim. Consequently, an economic decision was made to resolve the claim.