

Communication from Public

Name: Enough Tenant Fraud

Date Submitted: 11/03/2022 10:57 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Some thoughts on City Attorneys 1st draft of Ordinance to LAHD & City Council.... Attention councilman Lee, Buscaino and anyone else on the board who believes in personal property rights: Please do not agree to any of the Nithya/Eunices suggested changes to RSO. They are trying to exploit the "temporary" powers they were granted due to a public health crisis to accomplish political objectives and score points with their tenant caucus. At this point we should just wait until the emergency period due to pandemic is over and city council loses their leverage to shove more unfair changes down the throats of property owners. Nithya is not negotiating in good faith, she is trying to manipulate the temporary pandemic powers to kick property owners while they're already down. Why are we considering spending \$800k for a no bid contract to "Partners in Diversity"? Sounds the goal is to hire more housing investigators to go after landlords who may have violated RSO/2019 TPA/Eviction Moratorium guidelines? Is now really the time to be further punishing landlords? Why aren't we looking into tenants who falsely claimed being "effected" by Covid so they could avoid paying rent? Why aren't we trying to hold bad actors on both sides of the landlord/tenant relationship accountable for moral turpitude? Why should only 1x side be held accountable? If it is indeed necessary to hire 3rd party due to LAHD staffing shortages the job should be bid on the open market to ensure the entity hiring people to conduct investigations is impartial and not unfairly pro tenant like the city council awarding the contract. Are we considering "Partners in Diversity" because of their unique qualification to hire people to assist both landlords and tenants fairly or because they claim to value diversity and are a women/minority owned small biz that someone on city council or LAHD has a pre-existing relationship with or owes a favor? Why should a for profit halfway house/sober living not be allowed to evict a tenant who is drinking and/or using and creating an environment detrimental to the recovery of the other occupants in treatment at the property? The complexity of adhering to all of the bureaucracy of this plan combined with all of the punishments for a property owner being out of compliance are basically just setting up any property owner that can't afford an internal legal & compliance team up for failure Why have tenant relocation

amounts been rising during the city's state of emergency if rents have been frozen? Why is Nithya Raman allowed to cherry pick elements she wants to mirror from the county's guidelines to end the moratorium? I.E. - Nithya will find something she likes and say "we should do this, it's obviously fair look the county is doing it this way, we should mirror all of their guidelines!", The county is ending their moratorium on 12/31/22 and Nithya was trying to extend the city's to 2/28/23 and her supporters think it should never end....they think that not having to pay rent is a "protection" they should be entitled to forever... There is no need for a minimum threshold to evict. As it stands now all tenants have free legal aid available to them when they face eviction. Landlords have to come up with money to pay attorney and court fees. The free legal aid clinics have a playbook where they fraudulently accuse the property owner of every violation they can think of and force the landlord to defend themselves which costs time and money while the property owner has to continue to pay mortgage, RE taxes, insurance, maintenance, utilities. This process can easily take 6+ months which if the monetary amount of eviction is small gives the tenant more than enough time to catch up.