

pertinent data, it has consistently refused to do so, claiming initially that the Commission had no jurisdiction and, thus, had no right to see such records, and, following the formation of Meadowbrook Swimming Club, Inc., Meadowbrook claimed that, as a landlord, it had no power over the operations of its tenants and the Commission could not bring Meadowbrook into the controversy.

The Commission staff, after receipt of the complaint in June, 1964, investigated and published its "Findings of Fact", in which it was determined that Meadowbrook was a private club and the Commission had no jurisdiction in the matter. The Commission, however, reversed the findings of the staff, and, after several hearings and interviews, issued an order which determined, inter alia, that (1) there was discrimination against the complainant by Meadowbrook; (2) that the new corporation was a mere subterfuge and was, therefore, required to abide by the order, unless and until it could comply with the requirements for a private club under Ordinance No. 103, to the satisfaction of the Commission; and (3) that both corporations cease and desist in further discrimination against the complainant or others because of race, creed or origin.

On June 2, 1965, Meadowbrook's attorney advised the Commission that his client was not under the jurisdiction of the Commission, that the Commission's order was illegal, and requested that the matter be certified for action in the appropriate court. On June 3, 1965, the attorney for Meadowbrook Swimming Club, Inc. advised the Commission that the club could not comply with the order since no complaint had ever been filed against Meadowbrook Swimming Club, Inc. upon which the Commission's order could be based. On June 22, 1965, a stay of the order was signed, pending action by the Internal Revenue Service upon the application of Meadowbrook Swimming Club, Inc. for tax exempt status. This stay is still in effect, and the Internal Revenue Service has not yet replied to the application.

Counsel for Meadowbrook has argued that the complaint should be disregarded because it fails to comply with Section 16(b) of Ordinance No. 103, which requires that complaints must be submitted within thirty days of the alleged discriminatory act. The complainant's application for membership was made on June 6, 1964, but the complaint was not filed until July 27, 1964. Nothing was said to the complainant at the time the application was made for membership, except that she would hear from Meadowbrook in a few days. In fact,