

Submitter: JAMES REISINGER

On Behalf Of:

Committee: House Committee On Housing and Homelessness

Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2305

Case 1

Tenant brought a full size antic stand alone phone booth into the living room to recondition, including repaint. Scuffed the wood flooring and had paint splattered over large area. Constantly late on rent but would make payment, or partial payment, within the legal time frame stopping eviction. Tenant brought in a sub-tenant, claiming her to be a roommate. Finally able to get an eviction from court, including unpaid rent and damages totalling over \$3500. Have never been able to collect on the judgement. Had we been able to evict after three substantive violations, I feel we would have not suffered the physical damages and certainly not the lost rent.

Case 2

Tenant was consistantly late with rent payments. Always making payment, or partial payment, within the statutory 72 hours. Took us almost a full year to get him out and only after a 'CASH FOR KEYS' offer.

Case 3

Tenants were loud and abusive to other tenants, putting on single female tenant in fear of her safety. Multiple, notices, verbal and written, were given. Tenants were alcoholics and habitually coming home in the middle of the night awakening neighboring tenants. [Four Plex] After the above noted situation where the abusive tenants threatened another tenant, forcing her to move into a motel out of fear, we were able to file eviction and the tenants moved out. Had we been able to file eviction after three violations, notwithstanding their continuous promises to refrain, we would not had to pay for the tenant having to move out into a motel until we could have the abusive tenants vacated.

Having the ability too evict after three notices of substantial breach of lease would certainly make life much more tenable for us landlords. Especially if we could show breaching tenants a low giving landlords the ability to file for eviction.

Here is another pet peeve of ours. Something needs to be done about the current situation with ESA rules. As it currently exists, any person with a dog/cat/or ?? can call a licensed professional and speak with them over the phone, after giving their CC for the unscrupulous psychologist to issue a letter stating that the individual needed an emotional pet. And not a thing we can do. Not even inquire as to the nature of their condition giving rise to the ESA need. So, what so they do? They move in stating that they were not in possession of any dogs, cats, mini ponies, etc. Then, bingo, one day you hear a dog barking inside and other tenants complaining, they

present papers declaring them emotionally needing a pet and showing that their pet has had all the prerequisite vaccinations and licensing.