

Communication from Public

Name: Elaine Loring

Date Submitted: 05/03/2021 03:40 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the Council to support the tenant anti-harassment motion with the important amendments offered by Councilmember Ramen. The amended motion will give law-abiding renters some protection against those landlords who seek to harass folks until they leave their homes. We need to make it easier for tenants to push back against powerful bad actors through an amended 14-0268-13 AND by making a tenant right-to-counsel the law in our city and county.

Communication from Public

Name: Silvia Marroquin

Date Submitted: 05/05/2021 10:03 AM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Silvia Marroquin, I'm a Senior Community Organizer with SAJE. Please believe me when I say I have seen the worse human behavior when it comes to tenant harassment. One example I offered previously and it's so horrendous it's the attic to an 8 month old baby with chilly powder to its face. I support the strong anti-harassment tenant ordinance that includes Councilmember Nithya Raman's amendments. I do not support Councilmember Lee's amendments. Harassment is a tactic frequently used by landlords to silence and evict tenants. There shouldn't be an opportunity to cure harm.

Communication from Public

Name: G. Juan Johnson
Date Submitted: 05/20/2021 04:04 PM
Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: Housing Committee ; Mayor and City Council, and Public: I further comment on the draft for the Anti-Harassment of Tenant Ordinance (it should be named the Walter Barratt law). I previously have submitted comments 1/21/19 and 4/11/21. I think the main issues addressed by many are HARASSMENT, HOUSING SERVICES, AND ENFORCEMENT.

HARASSMENT: Providing tenants relief under local as well as state law seems to complicate the issues and will cause mass confusion as to which law a tenant should pursue. The city also may be promising more than it can deliver because it seems the RAC will have enforcement authority, and in my experiences RAC does a horrible job of enforcement, let alone the bias that city employees exhibit towards tenants. (See attachments.) The term "harassment" appears in numerous federal and state civil rights laws and including sexual harassment. Harassment can be civil as well as criminal. It seems the draft is meant to concentrate on housing discrimination as opposed to employment or civil rights generally. To that extent, the law will be problematic if it duplicates state or federal law without a good reason. Rather than pass this ordinance, why not pass a law where the city will provide legal assistance so a tenant can sue the landlord in court for harassment? State CCP law 527 covers and defines harassment. "527.6. (a) (1) A person who has suffered harassment as defined in subdivision (b) may seek a temporary restraining order and an injunction prohibiting harassment as provided in this section.... (b) For the purposes of this section: (1) "Course of conduct" is a pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time, however short, evidencing a continuity of purpose, including following or stalking an individual, making harassing telephone calls to an individual, or sending harassing correspondence to an individual by any means, including, but not limited to, the use of public or private mails, interoffice-mail, facsimile, or computer email. Constitutionally protected activity is not included within the meaning of "course of conduct." (2) "Credible threat of violence" is a knowing and willful statement or course of conduct that would place a reasonable person in fear for his or her safety, or the safety of his or her immediate family, and that serves no legitimate purpose. (3) "Harassment" is unlawful violence, a credible threat of violence, or a knowing and

willful course of conduct directed at a specific person that seriously alarms, annoys, or harasses the person, and that serves no legitimate purpose. The course of conduct must be such as would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress, and must actually cause substantial emotional distress to the petitioner.” The average person may have a tough time navigating requirements. IMO these are the grounds for seeking a TRO in court. I figure a city law cannot give a person less protection than state law. I figure a local law must correspond to the wording of state law, or else the landlord can use state law to fight against the local law allegations. Local law must identify that the tenant allege a series of acts or that the landlord conduct is repeated. To prove “substantial emotional distress” will be problematic. Any good attorney could tell you this. Under state law, the tenant will have to prove the acts of the landlord are intentional. Also, See (California Government Code Section 12900-12951 & 12927-12928 & 12955 - 12956.1 & 12960-12976) provides protection from harassment or discrimination in employment because of: age (40 and over), ancestry, color, creed, denial of family and medical care leave, disability (mental and physical) including HIV and AIDS, marital status, medical condition (cancer and genetic characteristics), national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.” The Unruh act also can protect against housing harassment. HOUSING SERVICES. Using “failure to perform necessary” repairs is vague. I think “necessary and agreed” or “repairs requested by tenant” might be more helpful. There is substantial disagreement over the phrase “everything in the unit not put there by the tenant should be in working order”. You will see from my attached emails that the fire department says the city has jurisdiction over intercoms, but code enforcement employees disagree. Biased and corrupt employees need to be transferred out. ENFORCEMENT. City says over 10,000 harassment complaints in 2018 (under what law?) because IMO the city employees do not make a diligent effort to enforce existing law. Whether the complaint has merit or not, there must be a fine just for the filing of the complaint. The Health and Safety Code 17920.3 is not just about substantial repairs if you read it. Code enforcement has jurisdiction over “General dilapidation or improper maintenance.” and “nuisance” conditions. G. JUAN JOHNSON, MAYORAL CANDIDATE.

Re: Voluntarry Relocation

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: thomas@powerpropertygrp.com

Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org; contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov; hcidla.rso.central@lacity.org; info@housingrightscenter.org; gavin@gavinnewsom.com; attorneygeneral@dojca.gov; walter.barratt@gmail.com; highpoint1522@gmail.com; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org; councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org

Date: Wednesday, May 12, 2021, 04:45 PM PDT

Re "Vacating for a Dollar Amount"- this is a public rent-controlled unit

Dear Thomas Khammar:/Hi Point Apts LLC:

This email shall respond to your email. This shall also memorialize the conversation I had with your employee Cynthia Reynosa earlier today.

First, I am surprised that you want me to respond to hearsay i.e you state "I heard you sent an email to Walter or someone within the team". I guess that is all you got since I have not heard from you or the owner pretty much not any conversation since you took over as property managers in 2019, other than maintenance workers into the unit.

When you say "heard", that means that you do not have copies of any letters or emails over the years sent to your office in which I mentioned a possible buyout? Walter has never given you any emails/letters of that nature of the past year? See you are already starting off on the bad faith foot. I also signed up for dispute resolution with the Court, which I think you ignored. My understanding is when a party ignores dispute resolution, the court will dismiss its case.

One of the most recent offers to vacate occurred in an email titled "2021-3-16 Email re sink repair and request buyout" (attached) or "**Garbage Disposal Repaired - Intercom Still Needs repair - Buyout Requested**". As you know, that offer expired on March 30, 2021. There was no response from your office.

Now your company is faced with numerous DFEH intakes, a small claims case where your company claims I am being sued by six different parties simply because I asked for housing services, and numerous code violations and city RSO complaints. In consideration of the court action, I anticipate the DFEH intakes may take years to investigate; the small claims case has not gone to court in almost 2 years. In normal circumstances, a lawyer (not me) might advise you to try to enter into a settlement agreement of all claims. So this email is my ASAP discussion with you as you requested.

Second, I had a pleasant conversation today with your employee Cynthia Reynosa at about 1:30 pm (Reynosa is named as defendant and cross complainant in the small claims case.) She knocked on the door unannounced and we talked in front of the building. She said she knew very little about the court case. I asked and she said that Thomas Khammar did not send her to talk with me, but she said she was in the area seeking tenants who would enter into buyout agreements. She said she would take my comments back to Khammar. I renewed my interest in the buyout stating similar conditions as my March 30 expired offer: \$50,000 that I would consider only on the grounds that the intercom unit 9 is repaired, that unit 9 is assigned either parking for two cars or a tandem parking stall (at no additional rent charges). "Consider" means that I would read over a buyout agreement only after the housing services are provided; that such buyout agreement would of course have to be agreed to by my roommate. Reynosa and I agreed that there is the possibility that if the housing services requested are provided by tomorrow, I could be reviewing a buyout offer the day after tomorrow. THIS OFFER IS GOOD FOR FIFTEEN DAYS from the date of this email. I have seen tenants in similar units offered \$100,000 to vacate, so I think my offer is a good deal. Of course, my roommate could ask for more than \$50,000. I believe the minimum the city requires for the buyout is \$21,900. (The LATU recommends a buyout goal of \$1 million dollars).

All rights and remedies are reserved. I reserve the right to modify, revoke, or amend this email at any time. It is not intended as a remedy or resolution of any claims against the defendants named.

Geary J. Johnson
1522 Hi Point St 9
Los Angeles CA 90035
Phone 323-807-3099

c: DFEH case JOHNSON/HARRIS case 202104-13236514

On Monday, May 10, 2021, 08:52:48 AM PDT, Thomas Khammar <thomas@powerpropertygrp.com> wrote:

Geary,

Good Morning. I heard you sent an email to Walter or someone within the team that you are interested in vacating for a dollar amount. Call me ASAP to discuss.

THOMAS Khammar | Managing Partner



property management | leasing | capital improvement | investments



powerpropertymanagement.com

Phone: 310-593-3955 x23

Address | Mailing Address: PO Box 472 Culver City, CA 90232
DRE#01443898

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE and DISCLAIMER: This email message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately. Nothing in this communication should be interpreted as a digital or electronic signature that can be used to authenticate a contract or other legal document. The recipients are advised that the sender and Power Property Management are not qualified to provide, and have not been contracted to provide, legal, financial, or tax advice, and that any such advice regarding any investment by the recipients must be obtained from the recipients' attorney, accountant, or tax professional.



2021-3-16 Email re sink repair and request buyout.pdf
91.3kB

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/02/2021 02:16 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: Please do not pass the tenant anti-harassment bill. It's already difficult enough to access units for maintenance and habitability repairs. This will only make it harder.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/02/2021 04:13 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the proposed Tenant Anti-Harassment Regulation - City of L.A

Communication from Public

Name: Peggy Christensen

Date Submitted: 06/02/2021 04:17 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: As a citizen of the US, founded on the rule of law and property rights, I am appalled and saddened by the continued assault on property and contracts. Property owners have been forced to provide housing at the expense to renters who have been released from their own obligations as part of a rental agreement. What country am I living IN??? Now this additional legislation, making it more and more unsafe to own property, especially in CA. APPALLING lack of respect for the hard earned rights of those who have worked and sacrificed to own property and provide housing, and actually thought a contract meant something. No more. Proposed Tenant Anti-Harassment Regulation – City of Los Angeles

Communication from Public

Name: Nadia Asemota
Date Submitted: 06/02/2021 04:42 PM
Council File No: 14-0268-S13
Comments for Public Posting: Completely disagree with this proposal. Landlords don't have any right any more and so many tenants take advantage of small landlord, this kind of action can take us out of the business. No landlord want to evict a good tenant.

Communication from Public

Name: Apartment manager

Date Submitted: 06/03/2021 01:44 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: Regarding the: Proposed Tenant Anti-Harassment Regulation – City of Los Angeles This is completely ridiculous. How about proposing a Landlord Anti- Harassment regulation to protect the property owners from abusive non paying tenants. There are already in place many protections for tenants. Very few property owners would dare to harass a tenant for fear of being sued already. this would just hurt the supply of housing, especially in the low income areas. Thank you,

Communication from Public

Name: Fonda Morgan

Date Submitted: 06/05/2021 08:52 AM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: In the city of LA, tenants have enormous amount of renter rights at landlord's expense. What's proposed here is against the fundamentals of the free enterprise. There are many many other ways for the tenants to bring up a harassments claim, but not through the lease agreement where it ties to the eviction process. Eviction is super limited in the city of LA due to RSO as is, adding this provision to the mix will discourage landlords to keep the rental property, hence, making the housing crisis worse. Please reconsider. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Michael L Byrne

Date Submitted: 06/07/2021 03:53 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: In regards to the Proposed Tenant Anti-Harassment Regulation - The government has already made it okay for tenants to only pay 25% of their rent owed during COVID 19, while not taking into consideration ALL of the costs like mortgages, property taxes, utilities, management fees, etc, etc, etc that Landlords are still responsible for. The Proposed Tenant Anti-Harassment Regulation is yet another way a tenant has an UNFAIR upper hand over a property the landlord OWNS. If passed by the Los Angeles City Council, it would enable tenants to delay all future evictions by filing an anti-harassment claim. If the tenant gets a judge who believes him, the tenant can collect \$10,000 to \$15,000 from the landlord and delay the evicition process by MONTHS. This is not fair! There are zero specifics around this. How can you put a he-said/she-said opinion into LAW?!?! Please DO NOT PASS THIS Regulation. PLEASE. Small landlords are over here just trying to get by without losing our life savings right now. Fight for the landlords for once, please. We're the "little guys" too.

Communication from Public

Name: stephanie rydall

Date Submitted: 06/09/2021 12:11 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: In regards to the Tenant Anti-Harassment regulation, this is ridiculous. I am a property manager, and what I have experienced over the years is criminal to building owners. Let's take the last two years, forcing retrofits at the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars, no rent payments, evictions, increases for the past 14 months is literally forcing owners to go in to major debt. Already governed by LA Rent control, people are paying such low rents as it is, yet every year city trash, electric, gas, water, sewer, fees, etc. etc. get increased. I have witnessed at several of my properties people not paying rent, receiving assistance meanwhile, and weekly if not more shopping packages, uber eats, starbucks, marijuana deliveries to their doors. Meanwhile we can barely make mortgage payments and essential bills. Not to mention the many who skipped out owing thousands in rent to us. I am flexible and work with people struggling to pay rent for 24 years I have been doing this work, not charging late fees, not annually increasing every year, not adding the 2% extra for utilities paid, only to watch people milk the system while jobs and owners are taking out loans to get by. It's time the harassment of OWNERS stop! Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: Nancy

Date Submitted: 06/16/2021 05:29 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: You're effectively taking all rights away from property owners who pay high taxes and ridiculous fees to state. Tenants now have more rights than property owners making investment in property a unsuccessful endeavor.

Communication from Public

Name: Terry Ballentine

Date Submitted: 06/21/2021 02:08 PM

Council File No: 14-0268-S13

Comments for Public Posting: As a responsible rental housing provider: I strongly oppose Councilmember Raman's amendments which would potentially place me in jeopardy of unwarranted, costly litigation. That the City Council must approve a balanced ordinance ensuring that renters that are subject to harassment are protected, while also protecting rental housing providers who have not engaged in harassing conduct from being subjected to unwarranted, frivolous and costly litigation or prosecution. Thank you for your consideration Terry Ballentine, Venice, CA 90291