

On Wed, Aug 19, 2026 at 7:05 PM Fannin Cline, Christel <FanninclineC@autonation.com> wrote:

Dear Paul, Brian and Kevin -

I never received a response from you last year in May in relation to the photos of the logitech device cover you claim was damaged by my, then, 12-year-old son. Additionally, I have never signed the handbook in the past, nor have I signed the technology agreement. I will not sign it this year either. I never assumed liability for those items and also responded that **the charge was exorbitant for a depreciated non-capitalized item**. Now, because of your lack of response to my reasonable request, and the associated action taken by the registration office of the SD, I am going to take it to the next level with an official dispute letter and FOIA request.

Furthermore, I have said it for the last 8 years and I will continue to state my disappointment at the way S161 **sends a net new un and pw paper letter via mail for each child every single year**. It was stated that this is a way to verify address and is a secure way to do so. Almost every year I have had issues with receiving one or the other of my children's letters, and the mail is not a "safe" method for transferring un/pw information. Furthermore, **there are about a MILLION better ways to fulfill registration** in a safer, more expedient manner.

This year when I called the office due to not having received the letter (nothing new there) they made me go online to pay money in order to receive it, even though I have been a property-owning, tax-paying constituent of Frankfort with a large part of my property taxes that are paid directly to the Summit Hill School district for 24 years. I have a past due balance from a previous year as well as the charge I am addressing here. The year they want me to pay, I sent in documentation to waive registration fees because I had lost my job for more than 6 months and could barely pay my mortgage and TAXES let alone school registration costs. Clearly no one ever processed the documentation I painstakingly had to collect and send. Those fees sit there year after year, even after reminding 161 staff repeatedly. Since that time I am gainfully employed and have paid fees accordingly, but keep waiting for the District to do its job.

This year, however, is the first year the district **withheld my un and pw for my son to register for school as confirmed by two personnel at the front desk, based on the past due fees and bogus charge you erroneously placed on my account**.

Additionally, when I did receive a letter from the district 5 days later in the MAIL, which I thought was the letter I needed with a un/pw, I opened it to find the **PII of another student, his parent's contact information and their un/pw**. Interesting indeed!

Please see the formal dispute and FOIA Request now that you have ignored my original request, unlawfully withheld my ability to register my son and caused undue frustration and valuable time spent on a charge that I should have never received.

RE: Written dispute of \$100.00 charge for damaged iPad keyboard case — Jackson Cline, Summit Hill Junior High, school year 2025–26

Dear Superintendent McDermott, Mr. Skibinski:

I received the District's notice dated May 27, 22026, assessing a charge of **\$100.00** for damage to the Logitech tablet case and keyboard cover issued to my son. I am writing to **formally dispute that charge** and to request the documentation described at the end of this letter. Please treat this letter as an appeal under the District's fee and fine policy and under the appeal procedure required by 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1.245(d).

1. I did not sign a technology agreement

The notice states that I signed a technology agreement. I did not. That was a deliberate decision, not an oversight. Please either **produce a copy of the agreement bearing my signature** and/or confirm in writing that no signed agreement exists.

If no signed agreement exists, please identify the specific **legal authority** — statute, regulation, or Board policy adopted under a specific grant of authority — on which the District relies to assess this charge against me. A liability term in an unsigned form is not a contract, and the District cannot create a payment obligation by asserting one.

2. Illinois law does not measure this loss by replacement cost

Even if a valid agreement existed, the amount would still be wrong. Under Illinois law the recovery for damage to personal property is the **lesser of** (a) the reasonable cost of repair plus any remaining loss in value, or (b) the difference between the item's fair market value immediately before and immediately after the damage — and the award may not exceed the item's value immediately before the damage occurred. See Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions — Civil, Nos. 30.10 and 30.11.

The case at issue was issued to my 12 year old son in August 2025 and was in daily, District-*required* use for roughly ten months. Charging the price of a new unit for a ten-month-old used one applies to the wrong measure and produces a windfall to the District which is gross misconduct.

3. The District has not alleged — and I do not believe it can allege — willful or malicious conduct

Illinois does not make parents liable for a child's ordinary negligence. The Parental Responsibility Law, **740 ILCS 115/3**, reaches only *willful or malicious* acts. If the District contends this damage was willful or malicious, please state that in writing and provide the factual basis. If it does not, then what is being described is ordinary wear or accidental damage arising from a device the District required my son to carry and use every day — which is an **operating cost** of the one-to-one program, not a debt owed by a family.

4. \$100.00 exceeds what the item is worth — and most definitely exceeds what the District originally paid

Publicly available pricing for the keyboard cases districts issue does not support a \$100 figure for a used unit:

- **New, at education-reseller pricing:** roughly \$85–\$110 per unit for a Logitech Rugged Combo–class keyboard case. The District, buying in volume, definitely paid less.
- **New, on the open market:** the same models clear at roughly \$69–\$90.
- **Used, on the open market:** functional pre-owned units of these models sell for roughly \$10–\$50.
- **The keyboard component itself:** on Apple's education institutional/government price list, otherwise identical bundles differ by only \$40–\$50 between a keyboard case and a keyboard-less case.

So, \$100.00 is at or above the price of a **brand-new** unit on the open market, and several multiples of the market value of a used one. If only part of the assembly is damaged — the shell but not the keyboard, or vice versa — the recoverable amount is smaller still.

5. Ten months of use has to be accounted for

Illinois' own school accounting rule, **23 Ill. Adm. Code 100.60**, places computer equipment on a **three-year** depreciation schedule at 33⅓% per year and expressly requires districts to **depreciate non-capitalized equipment** as well. Ten months is roughly **28% of a three-year life**. Under the Government Finance Officers Association's guidance, a \$100 item falls far below the recommended \$5,000 capitalization floor — proving it is a consumable supply, not an asset that holds its value. And districts themselves plan on three-to-four-year device refresh cycles, which is a statement about useful life.

If you'd like, I can forward an estimate of the item's depreciated value and fair market value. Every method I applied — straight-line depreciation, market comparables, and component cost — lands well **below** \$100.00. If I need to resort to this level, you can be sure I will also publish my findings to Illinois oversight, every social media outlet and will hold you accountable at the next School Board Meeting in public comments.

6. Has this loss already been covered?

Please state in writing whether the damaged item was covered by any of the following, and if so, whether a claim was made:

- an insurance policy carried by the District;
- a self-insurance or risk-management fund;
- a manufacturer or extended warranty, including AppleCare+ or broker for tech products (such as Logitech) for Schools or an accessorwarranty;
- a technology or device-protection fee already collected from families in registration costs.

If the District has already been made whole — through insurance, warranty, a protection fee, grant funds that purchased the item, or salvage and trade-in revenue — then collecting \$100.00 from me is a second recovery for the same loss and highly unethical. School districts are not a for-profit organization and I will definitely be raising this concern to the authorities.

7. No consequence may fall on my son

105 ILCS 5/10-20.13(d) provides that a school board “**may not discriminate against, punish, or penalize a student in any way because of an unpaid balance on the student's school account or because the student's parents or guardians are unable to pay any required fees or fines for the loss of school property.**” Please **confirm IMMEDIATELY, in writing that while this dispute is pending, and regardless of its outcome, the District will not withhold grades, records, transcripts, credit, a report card, schedule, device access, or participation in any activity**, and will not refer this amount to collections. You have already withheld registration per your own staff confirmation x2 due to this fee.

8. What I am officially asking the District to do

Within **14 calendar days**, please provide:

1. A copy of the technology agreement bearing my signature, or written confirmation that none exists;
2. An **itemized statement** of the \$100.00: the manufacturer and model of the item, the date it was placed in service, the actual per-unit price the District paid, the specific damage found, whether repair was considered and at what cost, and the calculation that produced \$100.00;
3. The District's written fee and fine policy, its published fee schedule for damaged devices, and its fee-waiver and appeal procedure;
4. A written statement of the legal authority for the charge;
5. Written answers to the insurance and warranty questions in Section 6;
6. The written confirmation requested in Section 7.

I am asking the District to **withdraw the charge immediately and remove all of the fees from 2021/2022 that should have been removed based on documentation provided YEARS ago**.

I have also submitted a request under the Illinois Freedom of Information Act for the District's device procurement, insurance, and fee-schedule records. I would rather resolve this directly with you in WRITING and look forward to an IMMEDIATE resolution and response.

Sincerely,

Christel Fannin-Cline & Joseph Cline, Jr
 Legal Parents/Guardians of Jackson R Cline
 cc: christeljoyfannincline@gmail.com
 cc: Joseph Cline, Jr (fatfingers77@gmail.com)

Christel Fannin – Director, Business Dev & Partnerships
 Digital Marketplace, AutoNation, Inc.

From: Fannin Cline, Christel <FanninclineC@autonation.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2026 8:08 AM
To: Brian Skibinski <bskibinski@summithill.org>
Subject: Re: iPad Charges for 7th Grade Students

Dear Brian -

will be returning the charging brick and cord directly to you today.

Please reply to this email with a photograph confirming receipt of these specific items so I can verify they have been successfully turned in.

Regarding the \$100 charge for the iPad case, I am formally disputing this fee.

Please provide a photograph of the specific structural damage to Jackson's assigned case.

Jackson and I noted that the keyboard began separating over the last month, which appears to be a structural fatigue issue common to this specific case model, rather than user negligence.

Furthermore, I did not sign the Parent/Student Handbook, nor did I agree to the rental, use, or financial liability terms for this device. This way of learning has essentially been forced on my child.

As a resident who has paid property taxes to this district for 23 years alongside annual registration fees, I am deeply concerned by this charge and have so many questions

A protective case issued to a child for nine months of daily school and backpack use will inherently deprecate and sustain significant wear.

Charging a flat \$100 for a deprecated, high-wear item feels less like property restitution and more like an underhanded way to shift standard district operational costs onto parents.

This situation is particularly frustrating given that I have repeatedly expressed my concerns regarding excessive screen time in the classroom and have explicitly requested that Jackson - who has a 504 - be provided with hard copies and physical textbooks instead of the increasingly used digital alternatives.

I look forward to receiving the confirmation photo of the charger today, as well as the photographic evidence and full replacement cost justification for the used case.

Christel Fannin – Director, Business Dev & Partnerships