

Communication from Public

Name: janice M.

Date Submitted: 06/06/2021 01:22 AM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: I'm sure that there are abusive landlords, but there's also VERY abusive talents. Something this ridiculous would tie landlord's hands so that they, and their fellow tenants can be abused completely. It's not fair to the other tenants who have the RIGHT TO ENJOYMENT OF LIFE!!! The others tenants rights would be completely destroyed by this. You must be out of your freaking minds. If a bad landlord is harassing a tenant it will come out in court let the courts be the judge that and stop governing our property rights so heavy white Communists

Communication from Public

Name: G. Juan Johnson
Date Submitted: 06/06/2021 03:56 PM
Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Committee Member and mayor and council and Ann Sewill (Director HCIDLA): I read with interest the comments of those who oppose the Harassment by Landlord Ordinance. I respect those views but other than minor corrections to the ordinance as written, I think the oppositions are misplaced for many reasons. First, those in opposition imply that tenants are not entitled to protection from harassment. Federal, state, and local existing law/ordinance say differently. And whether this ordinance passes or not, landlords as well as tenants will still have protection under existing laws that address harassment. Second, as many have said, it is a matter of degree that the tenants rather than the landlords, need a helping hand to navigate how to rectify harassment and housing service complaints. IMO even if landlords do not prevail in court, they still have the upper hand because landlords have the know-how, financial resources, access to legal help, time, that most tenants will not have. Often tenants will have to take off work to be present for code violation inspections or to go to court over landlord frivolous claims. COVID resources or not, the landlord still is in the superior position. Third, the landlord cannot blame the tenant for the conditions they accept as being a landlord. Yes, there is regulations regarding being a property owner, yes there are court procedures, yes there are repairs, and yes, there will be bad tenants, but that is the conditions you accept as a landlord. The landlord has the upper hand but also has the most responsibility and maybe the most to lose. None of that is the tenant's fault. Fourth, there may be pros and cons to making the ordinance apply to non-rent control buildings, which generally I do not oppose. In a rent controlled unit, there are 12 reasons why a tenant can be evicted. In a non-rent controlled building, those reasons do not apply. In a non-rent controlled unit, a landlord must only give 60 days notice and the tenant is essentially gone (barring if there was discrimination or retaliation complaints). In any building, violation of the house rules can be grounds for eviction. So if a landlord feels a tenant is violating the rules (or needs to revise the rules), then the landlord always has recourse to attempt an eviction, contrary to what some landlords have posted to this site. Last, I would like to see an automatic fine against landlords who are the subject of harassment complaints. But at the same time, the ordinance should specify the steps a landlord

and tenant should expect will be followed. The word "substantial" is not good enough and the phrase "reasonable amount of time" is subject to interpretation. A proposed series of steps could be the tenant has to prove (1) they notified the landlord orally or in writing by email or letter (2) within 5 days the owner did not respond and (3) within 5 days the tenant filed a written complaint with the city for harassment/denial of services. Once the written complaint is filed, it is presumed the landlord is at fault because they did not respond to the tenant's original two complaints. The law should specify what documentation the tenant must have to prove they contacted the owner. The state law has already stated that 35 days is "a reasonable amount of time" for repairs and thus this ordinance should give the landlord the 35 days. So the 35 days could be encompassed in the suggested 3 step process. Landlords must be held financially liable for neglecting to respond to tenant complaints about harassment, retaliation, or denial of services. Even under rent agreements, both parties have a duty to act in a good faith and reasonable manner. It is not good faith for the tenants have to wait months or years for repairs or other housing services or be ignored by the landlord. Ignoring the tenant complaints should make the landlord liable for neglect and negligence. I am reminded of a situation with property owner Walter Barratt/Hi Point Apts LLC/Power Property Management Inc. The Barratt rent agreement says a tenant is entitled to parking. Barratt et al disagrees. Federal housing law states that if a rental/housing service (maintenance/parking) is available, a landlord cannot tell the tenant the services are not available, as Walter Barratt has done for years; such conduct could be unlawful discrimination. Barratt does not recognize that housing entitlements to tenants arises from the law, the law that he is obligated to follow as a landlord. If services are "available" at the inception of the tenancy, the owner (LAMC) cannot charge a fee for those services or single out a tenant for unfair treatment. (See the CA Unruh Act , section 51). G. Juan Johnson. Mobile 323-807-3099. 2022 Candidate for Mayor of Los Angeles.