2018 MAR - 7 PM 3: 56

HOUSING, RESIDENTIAL RENT AND RELOCATION BOARD APPEAL PANEL

March 15, 2018 7:00 P.M. CITY HALL, HEARING ROOM #4 ONE FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA OAKLAND, CA

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- 2. ROLL CALL
- **3.** OPEN FORUM
- 4. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. Appeal Hearing in cases:
 - a. T16-0076; Lee v. Millar
 - b. T16-0683; Prager v. Lagos
- 5. SCHEDULING AND REPORTS
- **6.** ADJOURNMENT

Accessibility. This meeting location is wheelchair accessible. To request disability-related accommodations or to request an ASL, Cantonese, Mandarin or Spanish interpreter, please email sshannon@oaklandnet.com or call (510) 238-3715 or California relay service at 711 at least five working days before the meeting. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting as a courtesy to attendees with chemical sensitivities.

Esta reunión es accesible para sillas de ruedas. Si desea solicitar adaptaciones relacionadas con discapacidades, o para pedir un intérprete de en español, Cantones, Mandarín o de lenguaje de señas (ASL) por favor envié un correo electrónico a sshannon@oaklandnet.com o llame al (510) 238-3715 o 711 por lo menos cinco días

hábiles antes de la reunión. Se le pide de favor que no use perfumes a esta reunión como cortesía para los que tienen sensibilidad a los productos químicos. Gracias.

會場有適合輪椅出入設施。需要殘障輔助設施, 手語, 西班牙語, 粵語或國語翻譯服務, 請在會議前五個工作天電郵 <u>sshannon@oaklandnet.com</u> 或致電 (510) 238-3715 或 711 California relay service。請避免塗搽香氛產品,參加者可能對化學成分敏感。

Service Animals/Emotional Support Animals: The City of Oakland Rent Adjustment Program is committed to providing full access to qualified persons with disabilities hwo use service animals or emotional support animals.

If your service animal lacks visual evidence that it is a service animal (presence of an apparel item, apparatus, etc.), then please be prepared to reasonably establish that the animal does, in fact, perform a function or task that you cannot otherwise perform.

If you will be accompanied by an emotional support animal, then you must provide documentation on letterhead from a licensed mental health professional, not more than one year old, stating that you have a mental health-related disability, that having the animal accompany you is necessary to your mental health or treatment, and that you are under his or her professional care.

Service animals and emotional support animals must be trained to behave properly in public. An animal that behaves in an unreasonably disruptive or aggressive manner (barks, growls, bites, jumps, urinates or defecates, etc.) will be removed.

CHRONOLOGICAL CASE REPORT

Case No.:

T16-0076

Case Name:

Lee v. Millar

Property Address:

848 Erie St., Unit #2, Oakland, CA

Parties:

Mary E. Lee

(Tenant)

Bruce G. Millar

(Owner)

TENANT APPEAL

<u>Activity</u>

<u>Date</u>

Tenant Petition filed

February 5, 2016

Owner Response filed

March 17, 2016

Hearing Decision issued

June 17, 2016

Tenant Appeal filed

July 6, 2016

	3. 7. 1. 7. 1. 200 A. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.
City of Oakland Residential Rent Adjustment Program 250 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Suite 5313 Dakland, California 94612 510) 238-3721	APPEAL
Appellant's Name	
MARY E. LEE	Landlord □ Tenant Ⅳ
'roperty Address (Include Unit Number)	
848 ERIE ST., #2	
OAKLAND, CA 94610-2	205
ppellant's Mailing Address (For receipt of notice	es) Case Number
SAME AS ABOVE	Date of Decision appealed
lame of Representative (if any)	Representative's Mailing Address (For notices)
 (Check the applicable ground(s). Additional e. additional pages to this form.) 1. ☑ The decision is inconsistent with OMC 	the date written above on the following grounds: explanation is required (see below). Please attach Chapter 8.22, Rent Board Regulations or prior rdinance section, regulation or prior Board decision(s) and
2. The decision is inconsistent with decision the prior inconsistent decision and explain how the	ions issued by other hearing officers. You must identify decision is inconsistent.
3. The decision raises a new policy issue provide a detailed statement of the issue and why	that has not been decided by the Board. You must the issue should be decided in your favor.
4. The decision is not supported by substantial evidence found in the case but sections of audio recordings must be pre-designation.	antial evidence. You must explain why the decision is not se record. The entire case record is available to the Board, mated to Rent Adjustment Staff.

6.

The decision denies me a fair return on my investment. You must specifically state why you have been denied a fair return and attach the calculations supporting your claim.

5. I was denied a sufficient opportunity to present my claim or respond to the petitioner's claim.

You must explain how you were denied a sufficient opportunity and what evidence you would have presented. Note that a hearing is not required in every case. Staff may issue a decision without a hearing if

000004

sufficient facts to make the decision are not in dispute.

7. Other. You	must attach a detailed explanation of your grounds for appeal. Submissions to the Board
	ges from each party. Number of pages attached 7 Please number attached
8. You must s	serve a copy of your appeal on the opposing party(ies) or your appeal may
<u>be dismissed.</u>	declare under penalty of periury under the laws of the State of California that on
mail or denosited i	Dob, I placed a copy of this form, and all attached pages, in the United States
mail. with all posta	t with a commercial carrier, using a service at least as expeditious as first class ge or charges fully prepaid, addressed to each opposing party as follows:
	go of offergoo faily propaid, addressed to each opposing party as follows.
<u>Name</u>	Bruce G. Millar P. O-Box 11165
<u>Address</u>	P. O-Box 11165
City, State Zip	Oaklord, Ca. 94611
<u>Name</u>	
Address	
City, State Zip	
	ch.
	Mary E. Lee July 6, 2016
SIGNATURE OF APP	ELLANT OF DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE DATE
IMPORTANT INFO	RMATION.
	e <u>received</u> by the Rent Adjustment Program, 250 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Suite
5313, Oakland, Cal	ifornia 94612, not later than 5:00 P.M. on the 20th calendar day after the
date the decision w	as mailed to you as shown on the proof of service attached to the decision
If the last day to file	is a weekend or holiday, the time to file the document is extended to the
next business day.	
Appeals filed	late without good cause will be dismissed.
You must pro	ovide all of the information required or your appeal cannot be processed and
may be dism	issed.
 Anything to b 	e considered by the Board must be received by the Rent Adjustment
Program by	3:00 p.m. on the 8th day before the appeal hearing.
• The Board w	ill not consider new claims. All claims, except as to jurisdiction, must have
been made ⊪ The Board w	the petition, response, or at the hearing.
You must sig	ill not consider new evidence at the appeal hearing without specific approval.
a marian	n and date this form or your appeal will not be processed.

Mary E. Lee vs. Bruce G. Millar Case #T16-0076 (appeal)

I am appealing the decision based on many reasons;

I was not given an opportunity to review all evidence. The hearing officer error over my objections. Please review the pictures that I had provided as evidence. Please review the taped session of the hearing. I was allowed to testify generally.

- 1) The decision is inconsistent with OMC Chapter 8.22, Rent Board Regulations or prior decisions of the Board.
- a) This is in OMC Chapter 8.22090 A. Tenant Petitions. V. The owner decreased housing services to the tenant.

I was left without an oven since June 25, 2014. As previously stated PG&E was working on something to do with Smart meters and ultimately had to turn off my gas for reasons related to their gas line not working properly. When the workers came in to relight my oven, they could not get it to re-light (I suppose because the Kelvinator-Montgomery Ward's stove has been there since before 1974) due its age. As a result, they gave a notice so that I could file a claim to have one of their contractors relight it. However, upon filing the claim form, when it was discovered that I was actually the tenant rather than the owner, PG&E referred me to give the notice to the landlord, which I did the next day. Mr. Bruce G. Millar never re-light it and said that he could get one of his men to do it; he didn't need PG&E's contractors. However, he never followed through.

On September 26, 2014, Mr. Bruce G. Millar came into my apartment without notice or announcement, I suppose because his worker were demolishing my deck. The deck is located through my living room. To enter my kitchen mean he went clear out of his way to get to the kitchen, which was nowhere near the deck. He went clear out of his way to enter the dining room and then the kitchen, which is located in the middle of the building and going away from the deck. As it is, my upstairs neighbor whose familiar with construction work says the workers should have never came tromping through my living room and upon my carpeting to get to the deck. This could have been done from the outside.

This stove was cleaned at the time. Contrary to the hearing officer's misunderstanding of the PG&E's hazard notice written of grease and debris in an area of an old stove in which I could not get into to clean. This was under the burners. The stove had been cleaned, except that I cannot get under the old stove's range top to get under the grating, (which was not removable) to be able clean below it. The PG&E guy says that I am not supposed to get under there to clean it, that this was the landlord's responsibility and that he

knows because his dad own property in Berkeley. He then says that he will write up the hazard notice for the land lord to replace the stove with a new one and that he will buy me a dinner of my choice. He also took off the nut to the gas line when he learned through my surmising that it must have been the landlord who turned off the gas.

The pilot light to the stove's range top had already been turned off to conserve on the gas usage. I use a match to light each burner.

Mr. Millar had just been sent, from the City of Oakland, a week prior, a notice of my filing a claim with the Rent Assistance Program, due to an unfair rent raise.

Your landlord cannot lock you out or shut off your utilities without going through a legal process.

My landlord did not notify me during, prior nor answered my phone calls on Sunday, September 28, 2014, the day after being out for my birthday about turning off the gas. His workers then verified this to me and saying that wasn't the right thing to do. On that Sunday, when I was ready to use the stove with marinated salmon ready for steaming. I had called him three times and then leaving messages, of which there were no returned phone call nor returns to my messages.

The pictures provided during the hearing in which I objected to the dates and the hearing officer error and ignored me and then instantly took the pictures away from me, where no pictures of the current condition of that stove. Those were illegally gotten pictures of which I had told Benjamin Scott (board member of the Rent Arbitration Board) and Connie Taylor (Manager of the Rent Assistance Program) that these were not legitimate pictures and they had no right to use it. They were ill gotten pictures; they were not authorized to take pictures in my apartment without asking for permission. They were taken before Mr. Bruce G. Millar owned this building.

The living room was purposefully blocked off with my shopping cart so that no entry could be made other than to go to the bedroom. They had given short notice for a seemingly puzzling entry, on a Sunday, when the window had previously been reviewed. There was no written 24 notice and it was expressly to view the old broken window that was taped up by packaging tape for decades. Yet, while the previous landlord and I were waiting for Mr. Scott by the window, Mr. Scott apparently broke through my shopping cart and ran throughout the apartment without my permission, snapping pictures throughout. I feel

disrespected and invaded. I called Connie Taylor, very shortly thereafter and reported this, making sure that the pictures were not to be used and personally called Benjamin Scott at his business notifying him of the same. Yet Mr. Millar will now use these pictures and then changed his dates to reflect 2015 in July and August, of which he never entered my apartment then.

- a) After, he receives the notice for rent adjustment program's hearing, he his demeanor had changed. He was no longer speaking to me, his worker kept my second set of keys, never returning them to me, after I had lent it to him in effort to save him time and effort; his workers took my brand new broom O'Cedar broom without my consent and used it to sweep concrete, on the outside, when this is a house broom.
- b) Out of nowhere, I would get a written note, saying that he is not retaliating, that he has been speaking to me by phone and otherwise, when what he is stating is totaling to the contrary of his actions or inactions. These letters that are written appear to be a way of providing a paper trail for himself, although, they state that he is calling and speaking to me when he is not! He's written a letter to say that he is not retaliation against my RAP claim when he been calling me, talking to me and etc. when he hasn't returned my phone calls nor called me, or even spoken to me during that period.
- c) While, I was cleaning up the living room and needed another week or so, he would then write yet another letter telling me to clean up, while I am in the act of cleaning up. They are baseless, strange at the time and is made to fabricate a scenario to implicate me of my home for his benefit. This is so mean and this is so hard for me to fight and keep up with. I can't keep up with this man many ways of exaggerating his good works and his exaggerations of my bad ways. As a neighbor had said, it's been clear that you have been in a rut and depressed and have been through hard time, rather than be compassionate and of help, he is out to destroy me.
- d) Recently, I went to Just Cause for assistance and found that they have him in their computer. I was told by the front desk person that if he is in their computers, this means that he is a very terrible landlord. He apparently has many real estate properties, all over the bay area and beyond. At the outset of his ownership, the neighbors had found a newspaper article, in which the Eviction Defense Center were seeking volunteers to picket his home and to call him for an eviction. The neighbors had also discovered that he is well known in the real estate world as being a very bad landlord.
- e) Previous to Mr. Millar owning this property, he was already on the property tearing down signs. When I told Benjamin Scott, board member at Rent Adjustment, he did not believe me. However, after I had asked Mr. Millar and

- he confirmed his being here, then I again told Mr. Scott, who then answered, "Not to ethical is he?" There is more to come in this matter in relation to the evidence Mr. Millar produced at the hearing, in which I contested.
- f) December 22, 2015-Bruce G. Millar refused to fix kitchen pipe leak which flooded the kitchen floor. The Code Compliance officer wanted to speak with the landlord first, so I gave Mr. Millar's phone number. Upon this conversation, Mr. Shintz did not spend even 60 seconds in my apartment nor look at the pipe. Instead he kept saying that, "you're going to get evicted!" This happened on Christmas Eve, which left me very depressed and in bed all day without being able to fix anything to eat, despite being very hungry. At the urging of a friend, I went to Church for the Christmas Caroling, which helped greatly.
- g) Mr. Shintz contacted Adult Protective Services to help me. Adult Protective Services, Taurus and Stephanie (Supervision) was very helpful and supportive and said that my apartment is considered uninhabitable since Mr. Millar left me without a cooking appliance for two years. They had seen my apartment and advised me to **not move**. They had believed that Mr. Millar was going to knock out the kitchen cabinet and replace them and the kitchen tiling that had been there forever and was chipping. However this was not done, yet Mr. Millar would call this a renovation. Contrary to Mr. Miller's letter, again, he grossly exaggerated and turns the situation around to make himself look shiny and be damming to me, he claims that apartment has been condemned. I don't believe the apartment has been condemned, however Adult Protective Services got approval of their supervisor to be a witnesses on my behalf in court, should we needed to go with the Eviction Defense Center.
- h) Based on my reading of Mr. Millar's letter to the Rent Adjustment Program in defense of himself, he claims that the apartment was condemned (13P-Landlord evidence as produced during hearing). It was never condemned! He should know when it is condemned. He is very familiar with real estate, I am not! He then twist and with a big strength of his imagination falsely claims that the Supervisor, Stephanie at Adult Protective Services and her worker Taurus Johnson was claiming that the state of my apartment was uninhabitable. They were not! They were making reference to the stove being unusable as did other acquaintances who owns lots of property, to be without a stove for two years leaves the apartment uninhabitable. It's ironic, that Mr. Millar would choose to turn off the stove in September when it was cleaned, although right after a claim filed with the RAP rather than other times.

- i) Additionally, the refrigerator was purchased with my own funds. Mr. Millar had no right to neither take pictures of that nor even open it, as he has. More importantly, he donated my refrigerator for this refurbished used refrigerator that is more than 3 years old. It initially did not work and perished my new good food and ice cream until I called and had them fix it in March 2016. He traded my refrigerator in for this one, without my permission. Is this nerve or what? He does not honor boundaries. Then on the day that the refurbished one was to be delivered, I could not stay home due to Mr. Millar's worker Francisco's hostility and physical abuse. I had told Santos (the other worker) to have the food from the old refrigerator moved into the new one. However, Mr. Millar took all of that food.
- j) By the way, the new stove that Mr. Millar furnished is a 2012 stove purchased in 2016. I do appreciate this refurbished refrigerator and stove though. It is just Mr. Millar's unethical presentation of his evidence and ill gotten means of achieving it.
- k) In June 2015, I would get a letter from Mr. Millar's attorney and then again in July duplicating the same letter, only the cover letter changes a bit. I responded by writing Mr. Millar's attorney with a long letter detailing my experience during my tenancy and Mr. Millar's harassment. Finally, I sent a letter from my **therapist** and then from a **hoarder's group** that I was attending and doing homework for requesting more time.
- I) Although, Mr. Millar is now claiming that he has continually sent letters to me to clean up, he had not. Just the hand written letter sent to me in June 2014. Upon, that letter, I really tried to clean up and do it a little at a time, as being overwhelmed will defeat the purpose, also recommended by the Hoarder's group.
- m) During the month of August, I cleared the living room up for the workers to come in and demolish that deck, as per request of the landlord and I was timely. Whether Mr. Millar had the workers come through my living room rather than demolish the deck from the outside is a question as to whether he chose that route as a method of harassment. My neighbor whose familiar with construction work, says that the workers did not have to come through my living room and tromping through my carpeting, rather they could have demolished it from the outside.

- n) I was able to clear the living room in a timely way for the workers to come through. However, then out of the clear blue, a letter from Mr. Millar in September was out of place and served no purpose, except as a found less written documentation to serve provide written documentation to appear contrary to what I was doing. (13E, 13G evidence item from the hearing)
- o) I then seen the attorney for the RAP, who advised me to move my things into my garage, however, Mr. Millar said that I couldn't use my garage for storage. But, he has since given my combination of my lock to a neighbor whose been storing his items in my garage alongside my car.
- p) On August 4, 2015-National night-out for neighbors, Mr. Millar would have me served with an unlawful detainer. I responded in the days after having had gone to the Eviction Defense Center.

While he was chronically complaining of my messy apartment, through his lawyers letters (although, these letters were duplications of the same letters with a few lines on the front page letter changed only) yet he will have his worker scrape the hanging paint on my living room ceiling onto my new couch with clean clothes on it. They could well contain asbestos.

(The paint chips and hangings are due to the upstairs neighbor having broken an aquarium of water and flooding my apartment and with a broken apartment washer and flooding my dining room and living room of new carpeting and furniture. [This apartment still has shared piping, which means when the neighbors hair clogs my drain, then it is upon me to clear the drains.])

- 2) Mr. Kasdin, hearing officer did not even make introductions at the beginning of the hearing and it appears that Mr. Kasdin and my landlord Mr. Bruce G. Millar has had previous encounters and is familiar with each other. This made it difficult for me, then in effort to be polite, I had to ask Mr. Kasdin for his business card in order to know whom I am speaking to (or to whom was hearing this case)
- 3) It even appeared, (though the file was upside down for me) that there was a letter in the file addressed to Mr. Kasdin written by my landlord previous to this hearing.
- 4) Mr. Kasdin allowed Caryn Millar (witness for landlord) to take apart the case file remove and put additional papers into it.
- 5) Mr. Bruce G. Millar's whole team of supporters stayed behind to speak to the hearing officer while I excused myself after the hearing ended.
- 6) During the hearing, the Mr. Kasdin allowed Mark Bitzer (BGM witness) and Bruce G. Millar to insult and demean me during the hearing.

- 7) Mr. Millar and Mr. Bitzer made these extremely exaggerated, fabricated twisted lies about me, that it has and is very difficult for me to keep up and handled, during the hearing.
 - a) These same things happen in my apartment. They arrive in two's, three's and sometimes more people, while there is just me, myself and alone. They will spread and fan out on me, at the same time. They will invade my home, (space) and get into the most personal of my spaces without reservations, consciousness, or ethics. They cause me to feel overwhelmed and upset, like I just want to cry, they are so mean and unethical and audacious! Mr. Millar seems much practiced in his practices and behaviors with his intimidation and his harassment of me.
- 8) The bulk of Mr. Millar's evidence are of Mr. Millar's creation with his mixing and crossing of dates on pictures that are illegitimately gotten. His pictures are angled in way that makes his evidence look damming for me, i.e. while the pictures looks like I have more than 2 inches of clutter, yet the space does not even measure an allowance of 24 inches. Another word, Mr. Millar's pictures are design to be damming, rather than a report of a real problem.
- 9) Mr. Millar fabricated dates of entry, when he had never made entries on the dates that he claims.
- 10)Many of the pictures were taken by a Rent Arbitration Board member who had entered my apartment to view the broken window in my bedroom when it was still under previous ownership. The areas of pictures were blocked off and the board member was not allowed to enter, yet he went rampaging throughout my apartment snapping pictures for Mr. Millar in order to complete a sale. The previous owner and the board member did not give a 24 hour written notice to come in and I had blocked off the area that was not allowed to them.



P.O. BOX 70243, OAKLAND, CA 94612-2043

CITY OF OAKLAND

Department of Housing and Community Development Rent Adjustment Program

TEL (510) 238-3721 FAX (510) 238-6181 TDD (510) 238-3254

HEARING DECISION

CASE NUMBER:

T16-0076, Lee v. Millar

PROPERTY ADDRESS:

848 Erie St., #2, Oakland, CA

DATE OF HEARING:

June 1, 2016

DATE OF DECISION:

June 17, 2016

APPEARANCES:

Mary E. Lee (Tenant)
Bruce G. Millar (Owner)
Carolyn S. Millar (Owner)

Mark B. Izer (Witness for Owners) Caryn Millar (Witness for Owners)

SUMMARY OF DECISION

The tenant's petition is denied.

CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

The tenant filed a petition on February 5, 2016, which alleges that at present there exists a health, safety, fire or building code violation in her unit; and that her housing services have been decreased, as follows:

- Loss of use of stove
- Black grease in stove vent pipe
- Grease, stains, and chipped paint on walls
- Kitchen floor cannot be cleaned
- Spiders and ants
- Kitchen missing cabinet knobs; cabinet doors chipping; chipped grout
- Windows don't close well

- Bathroom vanity
- Inadequate hot water

The owners filed a response to the petition, which denies that the tenant's housing services have decreased.

THE ISSUES

- (1) When, if ever, did the tenant receive the form Notice to Tenants (RAP Notice)?
- (2) Have the tenant's housing services been decreased and, if so, by what percentage of the total housing services that are provided by the owner?
- (3) What is the legal effect, if any, of the tenant's Answer and a Stipulation signed by the parties in an Unlawful Detainer action between the parties?

EVIDENCE

<u>RAP Notice</u>: At the Hearing, the tenant testified that, as stated in her petition, she received the RAP Notice on July 29, 2014.

Rent History: At the Hearing, the parties agreed that the tenant has been paying rent of \$545 per month since April 2015.

<u>Decreased Housing Services:</u> The tenant testified that the unit in which she lives has not been inspected by a City Building Inspector. The tenant's petition states that she has lived in the unit since July 1, 1982.

Stove: The tenant testified that the oven in her unit stopped working on June 25, 2014, and the burners stopped working on September 28, 2014. The tenant submitted two PG&E Service Reports. The first, dated, June 25, 2014, states, with regard to the stove: "range two left and back right lit. Found range pilot valve off. . . Unable to get oven pilot to light." The second, dated September 28, 2014, is subtitled "Hazard Notice." This Notice states, in part: "Due to grease and additional debris in range unsafe to operate range/oven. Advised landlord to replace range/oven immediately." The Notice further states that the PG&E technician disconnected the stove. The owner installed a new stove in March 2016.

Mr. Millar testified that in September 2014, he was in the tenant's unit to inspect window installation. While there, he went into the kitchen, and saw that the top of the stove was covered with grease, as well as various objects. Mr. Millar turned off the gas line to the stove. He then sent a letter to the tenant, dated September 27, 2014. The letter states, in part: "I also checked out your kitchen as I have written to you many times about its condition and you have promised many times to clean it up. I turned off the gas to the stove. This was done in the interest of

¹ Exhibit No. 1A. This Exhibit, and all others to which reference is made in this Decision, were admitted into evidence without objection, unless otherwise noted.

² Exhibit No. 1B.

³ Exhibit No 13D. The tenant objected to the admission of this Exhibit into evidence because she did not receive it. The objection was overruled, and the letter was admitted into evidence.

safety . . . I think we are fortunate that there has been no grease fire to date. Three of the burners were covered with garbage, paper and cooking pots, all grease covered." On October 7, 2014, Mr. Millar again wrote to the tenant: "I asked you to clean the kitchen, and then call PG&E to turn on the gas. I will now reverse my request. Clean your kitchen and your entire apartment and I will purchase for you a brand new stove."

Mr. Millar submitted photographs of a portion of the kitchen including the stove that were taken on May 20, 2014 and July 15, 2015. Both of these photos reflect various items, including cooking utensils and plastic bags on top of the stove – which appears to be very dirty – as well as what can only be described as garbage nearly covering the floor and piled on an adjacent counter.

Grease in stove pipe: The tenant testified that there was black grease on the stove vent pipe, and that some grease had dripped onto the wall behind the stove. She submitted photographs that support this testimony.⁶

Walls: The tenant testified that there is grease on the walls of her unit. She further testified that she has never cleaned the walls. Photographs of several rooms taken in 2015 and 2016 reflect a nearly unbelievable amount of objects – sometimes several feet high – which would appear to make it literally impossible to walk from one wall to the opposite side of a room.⁷

<u>Kitchen floor</u>: The tenant testified that the kitchen floor surface was in such poor condition that she was unable to clean it. She submitted a photograph that reflects a filthy, crumbling floor surface. In addition to those photographs mentioned above, the owner also submitted photographs of the kitchen counter and a large area of the floor that were taken on September 25, 2015. These photos reflect a pile of what can only be described as debris approximately 2 feet high on the counters, and so much of what appears to be garbage on the floor that it is not possible to see the floor surface.

Spiders and ants: The tenant testified that there has been an infestation of spiders and ants in her unit. She has sprayed in an effort to kill the ants.

<u>Kitchen - cabinet knobs; cabinet doors chipping; chipped grout:</u> The tenant testified that all of these conditions had existed for some time. The kitchen was totally remodeled as of March 8, 2016, as reflected in photographs taken that day.¹⁰

<u>Windows:</u> The tenant testified that the wood frame windows were warped and rotted, which made it hard to open and close them. These windows were replaced in the Fall of 2014.

⁴ Exhibit No. 13C.

⁵ Exhibit Nos. 10A & 10B.

⁶ Exhibit Nos. 2A & 2B.

⁷ Exhibit Nos. 10D and 12B.

⁸ Exhibit No. 3.

⁹ Exhibit No. 10E.

¹⁰ Exhibit Nos. 11A & 11B.

<u>Walls:</u> The tenant testified that the walls were never painted, and they became stained due to steam from the bathroom and an accumulation of dust.

<u>Bathroom vanity</u>: The tenant testified that the bathroom vanity cabinet had become dilapidated over the years. She submitted a photograph that reflects chipped and peeling paint on several surfaces of the cabinet. The cabinet was replaced as part of a bathroom remodel as of March 8, 2016, as reflected in photographs taken that day.¹¹

Hot water: The tenant dismissed this claim at the Hearing.

<u>Photographs</u>: Copies of photographs of the unit mentioned above are attached to this Decision, as Attachments "A" through "E."

Answer to Unlawful Detainer Complaint: The owner submitted a copy of a document entitled "Answer to Complaint" bearing Case No. RG15-780571 in an Alameda County Superior Court action entitled "Bruce G. Millar et al. v. Mary Lee." This document bears the tenant's name as "Defendant in Pro Per," and is attached to a Proof of Service to the owners' lawyer dated August 6, 2015. 12

Paragraph 3 of this document states, in part: "Plaintiff has breached the warranty of habitability. The habitability defects include but are not limited to: inadequate weatherproofing on doors and windows; defective heater; no operable stove or oven; . . . dilapidated flooring; cracks and holes in walls; peeling paint; . . . ant/insect infestation; dilapidated vanity in bathroom; dilapidated kitchen sink."

<u>Court Stipulation</u>: On November 20, 2015, the parties entered into a written Stipulation for Judgment and Settlement Agreement (Unlawful Detainer Action) in the above captioned case, which was approved by a Judge of the Superior Court. This Stipulation provided, among other things, that the tenant pay back rent, clean the unit, and allow the owner to make regular inspections of the unit.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

RAP Notice: It is found that the tenant received the RAP Notice on July 29, 2014.

<u>Unlawful Detainer Action:</u> This case was concluded by the Stipulation signed on November 20, 2015. This date was before the tenant filed her petition and, therefore, the Answer and Stipulation have no effect upon the tenant's claims of decreased housing services after that date.

¹¹ Exhibit Nos. 11A & 11B.

¹² Exhibit Nos. 8A through 8E. ¹³ Exhibit Nos. 9A through 9F

Decreased Housing Services: Under the Rent Adjustment Ordinance, a decrease in housing services is considered to be an increase in rent¹⁴ and may be corrected by a rent adjustment. However, in order to justify a decrease in rent, a decrease in housing services must be either the elimination or reduction of a service that existed at the start of the tenancy or a violation of the housing or building code which seriously affects the habitability of the tenant's unit. A tenant will only be given relief for an owner's failure to make repairs if an owner has notice of a problem, a reasonable opportunity to do the needed work, and access to the appropriate area of the rental unit.

There is also a time limit for claiming decreased housing services. A tenant petition must be filed within 60 days after the date of service of a rent increase notice or change in the terms of a tenancy or the date the tenant first receives the RAP Notice, whichever is later. ¹⁶ However, when a tenant complains of ongoing problems with his or her unit, the Board has declared that such claims should not be completely denied if the tenant received the RAP Notice more than 60 days before the petition was filed.

The tenant first received the RAP Notice in the year 2014, far more than 60 days before filing her petition on February 5, 2016. Therefore, in accordance with the Regulations and Board decision, ¹⁷ the tenant can only be granted relief on her claims for decreased housing services beginning 60 days before the date on which she filed her petition. Allowable claims of decreased housing services therefore begin on December 5, 2015.

Stove: It is found that, when the owner disconnected the gas service to the stove, the condition of the stove, and the objects in and around it, presented an obvious fire hazard. Therefore, under these particular circumstances, the owner was justified in turning off the gas until such time as a new stove could be safely installed in the kitchen. The claim is denied.

Stove Pipe: A tenant is responsible for the routine cleaning of his or her unit. If the stovepipe was dirty, it was not the owners' duty to clean it, and the claim is denied.

Walls: Cleaning of walls is also the responsibility of a tenant, and the claim is denied.

Kitchen Floor: The photograph submitted by the tenant indeed reflects disintegration of the linoleum surface. However, the tenant's testimony that she was therefore unable to clean the floor is belied by the fact it would appear from the photographs that no portion of the unit had been cleaned for many months, if not years. Those portions of the floor that were not covered with debris appear to be absolutely filthy. Therefore, under these circumstances, the condition of the floor had no effect upon the tenant's housing services, and the claim is denied.

<u>Spiders and Ants:</u> In view of the condition of the unit before it was renovated, it is not surprising that insects and other pests would have found a home there. The claim is denied.

¹⁴ O.M.C. Section 8.22.070(F)

¹⁵ O.M.C. Section 8.22.110(E)

¹⁶ O.M.C. Section 8.22.090(A)(2)

¹⁷Appeal Decision in Case No. T09-0086, Lindsey v. Grimsley, et al.

<u>Kitchen - Misc.</u>: The photographs reflect a kitchen in such a filthy and cluttered condition that relatively minor problems could hardly be noticed, and access to any area would be difficult. The claim is denied.

Windows: Since the windows were replaced in 2014, the claim is time-barred, and is denied.

<u>Walls:</u> Given the condition of the unit before renovation, it is would be surprising if the walls were not stained. Further, cleaning of walls is the responsibility of a tenant. The claim is denied.

<u>Bathroom Vanity:</u> Although the paint on sections of the vanity had peeled, in view of the overall condition of the unit, peeling paint on a vanity cabinet had little or no effect upon the tenant's use or enjoyment of the unit. This claim is denied.


<u>ORDER</u>

- 1. Petition T16-0076 is denied.
- 2. <u>Right to Appeal</u>: This decision is the final decision of the Rent Adjustment Program Staff. Either party may appeal this decision by filing a properly completed appeal using the form provided by the Rent Adjustment Program. The appeal must be received within twenty (20) calendar days after service of the decision. The date of service is shown on the attached Proof of Service. If the Rent Adjustment Office is closed on the last day to file, the appeal may be filed on the next business day.

Dated: June 17, 2016-


Stephen Kasdin Hearing Officer

Rent Adjustment Program












000019 ATTACIMENT "A"




5/20/14





7/15/15



000020

ATTACHMENT "B"







000021

ATTACIMENT "C"











000022

ATTACHMENT "I"



8/26/15





8/20/15

000023

ATTACHMENT "E"

T16.0076 RC/SK

CITY OF OAKLAND

RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mail To: P. O. Box 70243

Oakland, California 94612-0243

(510) 238-3721

Please print legibly

For date stamp.

2016 FEB - 5 PM 4: 41

STORMA LAPRICA.A.

Please Fill Out This Form As Completely As You Can. Failure to provide needed information may result in your petition being rejected or delayed.

TENANT PETITION

Your Name	Rental A	ddress (with zip code)	Telephone		
MARKEITT	84	P-ERIE ST.	#2 415-894-7262		
MARY E. LEE		DAKLAND.	04 115011 1002		
Your Representative's Name	Mailing A	DAKI-AXD, Address (with zip code)	GY6 Telephone		
A I A	Maning /	,	11/4		
\mathcal{N}/π		NA	/0///		
Property Owner(s) name(s)	Mailing A	Address (with zip code)	Telephone		
Bruce G. Melar	P	D. BOX11/65	925-855-0419		
	Ta	Dakoond, Ca. 94611			
	Se	grana ca.	1761/		
Number of units on the property	([
Number of units on the property:	1	· ·			
Type of unit you rent					
(circle one)	ise	Condominium	Apartment, Room, or Live-Work		
Are you current on your	1)	NT.	Legally Withholding Rent. You must attach an		
rent? (circle one)	s /	No	explanation and citation of code violation.		
	,				
I. GROUNDS FOR PETITION					
•		MC 8.22.090. I (We)	contest one or more rent increases on		
one or more of the following ground			100/		
(a) The increase(s) exceed(s) the C	CPI Adjust	ment and is (are) unjust	ified or is (are) greater than 10%.		
			the increase despite my written request.		
(c) The rent was raised illegally af					
(d) No written notice of Rent Prog	_		n the notice of increase(s) I am		
contesting. (Only for increases not		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	rom was not given to me at least six		
months before the effective date o			ram was not given to me at least six		
			nplete Section III on following page)		
			olation in the unit. If the owner has been		
cited in an inspection report, please attach a copy of the citation or report. (g) The contested increase is the second rent increase in a 12-month period.					
(h) The notice of rent increase based upon capital improvement costs does not contain the "enhanced					
notice" requirements of the Rent Adjustment Ordinance or the enhanced notice was not filed with the RAP.					
(i) My rent was not reduced after the expiration period of the rent increase based on capital improvements.					
(i) The proposed rent increase would exceed an overall increase of 30% in 5 years. (The 5-year period					
begins with rent increases noticed on or after August 1, 2014).					
(k) I wish to contest an exemption			ance (OMC 8.22, Article I)		
		1			
		•			

	ISTORY: (You						
Date you moved	into the Unit:	elez 1, 19	82 Initia	al Rent: \$	2/5.0	7)	/month
When did the ow Adjustment Progress Is your rent s	ner first provide yo ram (RAP NOTIC ubsidized or contr	ou with a written (E)? Date:	en NOTICE TO	TENANTS If neve	of the exister provided, g HUD (Sec	ence of the enter "Never tion 8)?	es No
you need addition	reases that you wa onal space, please	int to challeng attach anothe	ge. Begin with er sheet. You	the most red must check '	'Yes" next	to each inc	rease that
you are challeng	ging.						
Date Notice Served (mo/day/year)	Date Increase Effective (mo/day/year)	Amount Re	nt Increased	Are you C this Increa Petiti	ise in this	Did You I Rent Pr Notice V Notic	ogram Vith the
		From	То			Incre	
		\$	\$.	□ Yes	□No	☐ Yes	□ No
		\$.	\$	□ Yes	□No	□ Yes	□No
		\$	\$	□ Yes	□No	□Yes	□No
		\$	\$	□Yes	□No	□ Yes	□No
		\$	\$	□Yes	□No	□Yes	□No
		\$	\$	☐ Yes	□No	□ Yes	. 🗆 No
* You have 60 days from the date of notice of increase or from the first date you received written notice of the existence of the Rent Adjustment program (whichever is later) to contest a rent increase. (O.M.C. 8.22.090 A 2) If you never got the RAP Notice you can contest all past increases. List case number(s) of all Petition(s) you have ever filed for this rental unit: III. DESCRIPTION OF DECREASED OR INADEQUATE HOUSING SERVICES: Decreased or inadequate housing services are considered an increase in rent. If you claim an unlawful rent increase for service problems, you must complete this section. Are you being charged for services originally paid by the owner? Have you lost services originally provided by the owner or have the conditions changed? Yes No Are you claiming any serious problem(s) with the condition of your rental unit?							
If you answere reduced service service(s) or se	ed "Yes" to any o e(s) and problem(erious problem(s) 3) how you calo	of the above, (s). Be sure to ; 2) the date	please attach include at lea the loss(es) b	a separate s ast the follow began or the	sheet listing ving: 1) a l date you	ist of the lo began pay	ost housing ing for the

To have a unit inspected and code violations cited, contact the City of Oakland, Code Compliance Unit, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor, Oakland, CA 94612. Phone: (510) 238-3381

documentary evidence if available.

IV. VERIFICATION: The tenant must sign:

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California that everything I said in this petition is true and that all of the documents attached to the petition are true copies of the originals.
Mary E. Lea Feb. 5, 2016. Tenant's Signature Date
V. MEDIATION AVAILABLE: Mediation is an entirely voluntary process to assist you in reaching an agreement with the owner. If both parties agree, you have the option to mediate your complaints before a hearing is held. If the parties do not reach an agreement in mediation, your case will go to a formal hearing before a Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officer the same day.
You may choose to have the mediation conducted by a Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officer or select an outside mediator. Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officers conduct mediation sessions free of charge. If you and the owner agree to an outside mediator, please call (510) 238-3721 to make arrangements. Any fees charged by an outside mediator for mediation of rent disputes will be the responsibility of the parties requesting the use of their services.
Mediation will be scheduled only if both parties agree (after both your petition and the owner's response have been filed with the Rent Adjustment Program). The Rent Adjustment Program will not schedule a mediation session if the owner does not file a response to the petition. Rent Board Regulation 8:22.100.A.
If you want to schedule your case for mediation, sign below.
I agree to have my case mediated by a Rent Adjustment Program Staff Hearing Officer (no charge).
Tenant's Signature Date
VI. IMPORTANT INFORMATION:
Time to File This form must be received at the offices of the City of Oakland, Rent Adjustment Program, Dalziel Building, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza Suite 5313, Oakland, CA 94612 within the time limit for filing a petition set out in the Rent Adjustment Ordinance, Oakland Municipal Code, Chapter 8.22. Board Staff cannot grant an extension of time to file your petition by phone. For more information, please call: (510) 238-3721.
File Review The owner is required to file a Response to this petition within 35 days of notification by the Rent Adjustment Program. You will be mailed a copy of the Landlord's Response form. Copies of documents attached to the Response form will not be sent to you. However, you may review these in the Rent Program office by appointment. For an appointment to review a file call (510) 238-3721; please allow six weeks from the date of filing before scheduling a file review.
VII. HOW DID YOU LEARN ABOUT THE RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM?
Printed form provided by the owner Pamphlet distributed by the Rent Adjustment Program Legal services or community organization Sign on bus or bus shelter

Other (describe):

1) No working oven since June 25th, 2014.

PG&E – 2 workers working on smart meter turned off my gas to oven. Came into re-light and could not re-light, as a result gave hazard notice. When Bruce G. Millar (in upstairs apartment overheard this and misunderstanding believed that I had called PG&E, he told me to move or we will fight this out in court.) When I filed claim form with PG&E to have my oven re-light, they learned I was not owner and told me to turn over to owner with hazard notice. I was not aware that I needed to make a copy, since, owner never re-light, but continue to make nuisance complaints of not having an immaculate apartment for re-lighting the oven.

- a) September 28, 2014- Bruce G. Millar came in apartment, while I was not home, and turned off pilot light to top burners. I did not know until I was ready to steam marinated salmon for cooking. I, then called Bruce G. Millar 3 times, without success of a return phone call. I then called PG&E, whom came out and took off the nut to the gas line and wrote hazard notice for owner to replace with a new stove. To date, I do not have use of a stove.
- b) January 19th, 2016 Adult Protective Services came and inspected my apartment and says it is uninhabitable.
- 2) There's <u>black grease leaking out</u> of silver metal pipe leading from the stove to the outside.
- 3) There's grease on walls in the kitchen over the stove-never a paint job since 1974.
- 4) The kitchen floor is not cleanable; it has become paste upon mopping.
 - a) There was a leak in the kitchen sink pipe that Bruce G. Millar refused to fix until I called City of Oakland's Code & Compliance. January 6, 2016.
- 5) There are Black Widow spiders, spiders and a huge ant infestation, all in the kitchen, bathroom, and living room.
- 6) There's missing knobs on cabinet doors, the wood on cabinet drawers are chipping saw dust, rotten away and spitted up and cracked. There's grout that has chipped away on the kitchen since having me worried the sink may drop.
- 7) There's rotten wood windows that won't close well in the dining room and bedroom that he has know of before he bought this building.
- 8) There is chipping and peeling paint in the living room, occupying a fourth of the living room and also in the opposite side of the room. The owner had come in while he suing me for eviction and had someone scrapped the paint onto my clothing on my couch and on the floors without clean up.
- 9) The hall wall has brown walls from steam and dust.
- 10) The bathroom has a rotten vanity and it is unleveled, consequently I have had to keep 2 sponges on the edge continuously in order for water not to drain onto my neighbor's garage. Bruce G. Millar was going to cite me for these sponges as a clause in his eviction points, until he realized why they were there.
- 11) There is chipped paint and walls are brown from steam and dust in the bathroom.
- 12) The hot water heater does not give enough hot water to complete a short shower.
- 13) These are among some of the items of concern and not just limited to these.

CITY OF OAKLAND RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

P.O. Box 70243 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 5313 Oakland, CA 94612

(510) 238-3721

For filing stamp.

RECEIVED)

MAR 17 2016

BENTADJUSTMENT PROGRAM OAKLAND

<u>Please Fill Out This Form As Completely As You Can</u>. Failure to provide needed information may result in your response being rejected or delayed.

CASE NUMBER T 16-0094

OWNER RESPONSE

Please print legibly.		
Bruce G. Millar	Complete Address (with zip code) P.O. BOX 11165	Phone: <u>925-855-0419</u>
	P.O. BOX 11165 Oakland, CA 94611	Email:
Your Representative's Name (if any)	Complete Address (with zip code)	Phone:
Self		Fax:
		Email:
Tenant(s) name(s) Mary Lec	Complete Address (with zip code) 848 Erie St. #2 OUKLAND, CA 94011	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Have you paid for your Oakland Bus (Provide proof of payment.)	iness License? Yes ☑ No ☐ Num	ber 28045835
(Provide proof of payment.)	Program Service Fee? (\$30 per unit) Yes	
There are residential units	in the subject building. I acquired the bu	ilding on <u>5/15/14</u> .
Is there more than one street address	^	
I. RENTAL HISTORY		
The tenant moved into the rental unit	on 1/1/1982.	
The tenant's initial rent including all	services provided was \$ 2/5 -	month.
RESIDENTIAL RENT ADJUSTM	n the City of Oakland's form entitled NO ENT PROGRAM ("RAP Notice") to al yes, on what date was the Notice first give	l of the petitioning tenants?
Is the tenant current on the rent? Yes		
If you believe your unit is exempt from	m Rent Adjustment you may skip to <u>Sect</u> i	ion IV. EXEMPTION.

Rev. 2/25/15

Tenants for Cap date was the Enha to the RAP office no capital improv	ital Improvement inced Notice given within 10 days of ements increase	s to the petitioning t? serving the tenant?	ents, did you providenant(s)? Yes Did you submit a Yes No ackwards. Attach a	No If y copy of the Enhan Not applicable	es, on what need Notice or there was	
Date Notice Given (mo/day/year)	Date Increase Effective (mo/day/year)	Amount Rent Increased		Did you provide NOTICE TO TENANTS with the notice of rent increase?		
(o. a.a.j.) c.a.i/	(morauj/your)	\$	15	□ Yes	□ No	
		\$	\$	□Yes	□No	
		\$	\$	□ Yes	□No	
		\$	\$	□Yes	□No	
		\$	\$	□ Yes	□No	
		\$	\$	□ Yes	□No	

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR RENT INCREASE

You must prove that each contested rent increase greater than the Annual CPI Adjustment is justified and was correctly served. Use the following table and check the applicable justification(s) box for each increase contested by the tenant(s) petition. For a summary of these justifications, please refer to the "Justifications for Increases Greater than the Annual CPI Rate" section in the attached Owner's Guide to Rent Adjustment.

<u>Date of</u> Increase	Banking (deferred annual increases_)	Increased Housing Service Costs	Capital Improve- ments	Uninsured Repair Costs	Fair Return	Debt Service (if purchased before 4/1/14)
				. 🗆		
			/ April 1			
			<i>"</i>		□ •	
			<u> </u>			

For each justification checked, you must submit organized documents demonstrating your entitlement to the increase. Please see the "Justifications" section in the attached Owner's Guide for details on the type of documentation required. In the case of Capital Improvement increases, you must include a copy of the "Enhanced Notice to Tenants for Capital Improvements" that was given to tenants. Your supporting documents do not need to be attached here, but are due in the RAP office no later than seven (7) days before the first scheduled Hearing date.

III. DECREASED HOUSING SERVICES

If the petition filed by your tenant claims **Decreased Housing Services**, state your position regarding the tenant's claim(s) of decreased housing services on a separate sheet. Submit any documents, photographs or other tangible evidence that supports your position.

IV	EXEMPTION	
1 Y .		

If you claim that your property is exempt from Rent Adjustment (Oakland Municipal Code Chapter 8.22), please check one or more of the grounds: The unit is a single family residence or condominium exempted by the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (California Civil Code 1954.50, et seq.). If claiming exemption under Costa-Hawkins, please answer the following questions on a separate sheet: Did the prior tenant leave after being given a notice to quit (Civil Code Section 1946)? Did the prior tenant leave after being given a notice of rent increase (Civil Code Section 827)? Was the prior tenant evicted for cause? Are there any outstanding violations of building housing, fire or safety codes in the unit or building? 5. Is the unit a single family dwelling or condominium that can be sold separately? 6. Did the petitioning tenant have roommates when he/she moved in? 7. If the unit is a condominium, did you purchase it? If so: 1) from whom? 2) Did you purchase the entire building? The rent for the unit is controlled, regulated or subsidized by a governmental unit, agency or authority other than the City of Oakland Rent Adjustment Ordinance. The unit was newly constructed and a certificate of occupancy was issued for it on or after January 1, 1983. On the day the petition was filed, the tenant petitioner was a resident of a motel, hotel, or boarding house for less than 30 days. The subject unit is in a building that was rehabilitated at a cost of 50% or more of the average basic cost of new construction. The unit is an accommodation in a hospital, convent, monastery, extended care facility, convalescent home, non-profit home for aged, or dormitory owned and operated by an educational institution. The unit is located in a building with three or fewer units. The owner occupies one of the units continuously as his or her principal residence and has done so for at least one year.

V. IMPORTANT INFORMATION

Time to File. This form must be received by the Rent Adjustment Program, P.O. Box 70243, Oakland, CA 94612-0243, within 35 days of the date that a copy of the Tenant Petition was mailed to you. (The date of mailing is shown on the Proof of Service attached to the Tenant Petition and other response documents mailed to you.) A postmark does not suffice. If the RAP office is closed on the last day to file, the time to file is extended to the next day the office is open. If you wish to deliver your completed Owner Response to the Rent Adjustment Program office in person, go to the City of Oakland Housing Assistance Center, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor, Oakland, where you can date-stamp and drop your Response in the Rent Adjustment drop box. The Housing Assistance Center is open Monday through Friday, except holidays, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. You cannot get an extension of time to file your Response by telephone.

NOTE: If you do not file a timely Response, you will not be able to produce evidence at the Hearing, unless you can show good cause for the late filing.

<u>File Review.</u> You should have received a copy of the petition (and claim of decreased services) filed by your tenant with this packet. Other documents provided by the tenant will not be mailed to you. You may review additional documents in the RAP office by appointment. For an appointment to review a file or to request a copy of documents in the file call (510) 238-3721.

VI. VERIFICATION

Owner must sign here:

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California that all statements made in this Response are true and that all of the documents attached hereto are true copies of the originals. Owner's Signature VII. MEDIATION AVAILABLE Your tenant may have signed the mediation section in the Tenant Petition to request mediation of the disputed issues. Mediation is an entirely voluntary process to assist the parties to reach an agreement on the disputed issues in lieu of a Rent Adjustment hearing. If the parties reach an agreement during the mediation, a written Agreement will be prepared immediately by the mediator and signed by the parties at that time. If the parties fail to settle the dispute, the case will go to a formal Rent Adjustment Program Hearing, usually the same day. A Rent Adjustment Program staff Hearing Officer serves as mediator unless the parties choose to have the mediation conducted by an outside mediator. If you and the tenant(s) agree to use an outside mediator, please notify the RAP office at (510) 238-3721. Any fees charged by an outside mediator for mediation of rent disputes will be the responsibility of the parties requesting the use of their services. (There is no charge for a RAP Hearing Officer to mediate a RAP case.) Mediation will be scheduled only if both parties request it – after both the Tenant Petition and the Owner Response have been filed with the Rent Adjustment Program. The Rent Adjustment Program will not schedule a mediation session if the owner does not file a response to the petition. (Rent Board Regulation 8.22.100.A.) If you want to schedule your case for mediation, sign below. I agree to have my case mediated by a Rent Adjustment Program Staff Hearing Officer (no charge).

Owner's Signature

Date

RECEIVED

MAR 1.7 2016

OAKLAND RENT ADJUSTMENT

City of Oakland RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 5313, 5th Floor Oakland, CA 94612

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in response to a letter I received from the City of Oakland Rent Adjustment Program in regards to a tenant petition from my tenant, Mary E. Lee. Ms. Lee resides at 848 Erie St., Apt. 2, a building that I purchased 5/15/2014.

Ms. Lee is protesting a "Decrease in Housing Services". Ms. Lee has listed off a number of items, beginning with No Working Oven since June 25, 2014. Since purchasing this building in May of 2014, I have sent Ms. Lee numerous letters requesting that she clean her apartment (enclosed). The condition she kept it in was uninhabitable and was a severe fire hazard, endangering the lives of her neighboring tenants (pictures enclosed). After many requests for her to clean her apartment, I turned off the gas to her stove on 9/26/2014 because her kitchen and living space was a fire hazard. There continued to be garbage, paper and grease covered cooking pots littering her stove top and her kitchen remained in an unusable condition. I advised her to clean her kitchen and call PG&E to turn the gas back on. When she called PG&E, they refused to turn the gas back on due to grease and debris on the range and advised replacement of the unit (service report enclosed). I told Mary when she cleaned her kitchen and it wasn't a fire hazard, I would replace her stove. I offered to pay for a professional service to help Ms. Lee clean her apartment, she refused. Ms. Lee continued to ignore my requests; which forced me to take legal action. Throughout the legal process and up until one of the last inspections before eviction, Ms. Lee refused to clean her apartment and continued to put people's lives at risk due to the condition she kept her apartment in (dated pictures enclosed). Her apartment was deemed uninhabitable by Adult Protective Services on 1/19/2016. A threat of eviction was eminent and Ms. Lee finally cleaned her apartment. I have been more than accommodating to Ms. Lee, I offered to pay for a cleaning service to help her, I waited over a year to take legal action and I granted several extensions on the inspection time so that she could get her apartment in order and avoid an eviction (letters enclosed).

Some of her other protests, the black grease leaking out of metal pipe from stove, grease on the walls, kitchen floor being not cleanable, spiders and ants, brown walls from steam and dust, this is all is due to the condition that she kept her apartment in. She, as a tenant, is expected to maintain a clean and orderly living space.

The remaining protests, kitchen walls need painting, missing knobs on cabinet doors, grout chipping, bathroom has rotten vanity, chipping paint in bathroom and living room ceiling, etc... I planned on renovating Ms. Lee's kitchen and bathroom as soon as she cleaned up, then I received this complaint. Since then, I have done the following renovations to Ms. Lee's apartment (pictures enclosed):

- I had a professional cleaning service clean the kitchen and bathroom before renovations began.
- <u>Kitchen:</u> new linoleum floor, knob replacement on cabinet doors, new stove, reconditioned refrigerator, grease covered pipe removed.
- <u>Living room</u>: painted ceiling
- <u>Bathroom:</u> new vanity, painted walls

I have enclosed my letters requesting that Ms. Lee clean her apartment, her responses to those letters, PG&E's service reports, Legal letters from My Attorney and Ms. Lee's attorney during legal proceedings and pictures of Ms. Lee's apartment over the past 2 years. All serves as tangible evidence that supports my position.

Sincerely,

Bruce G. Millar

Enclosure: Letters

Legal documents

my In Miller

Photos

CHRONOLOGICAL CASE REPORT

Case No.:

T16-0683

Case Name:

Prager v. Lagos

Property Address: 95 41st St., Unit #202, Oakland, CA

Parties:

Marc Prager

(Tenant)

Panos Lagos

(Owner)

OWNER APPEAL

Activity

Date

Tenant Petition filed

December 2, 2016

Owner Response filed

December 30, 2016

Hearing Decision issued

June 13, 2017

Owner Appeal filed

July 3, 2017



CITY OF OAKLAND RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

P.O. Box 70243 Oakland, CA 94612-0243 (510) 238-3721



JUL 03 2017

RENT ADJUSTIMENT PRAREAL

Appellant's Name	
Panos Lagos	■ Owner □ Tenant
Property Address (Include Unit Number)	
95 41st Street, #202 Oakland, CA 94611	
Appellant's Mailing Address (For receipt of notices)	Case Number
5032 Woodminster Lane	T16-0683, Prager v. Lagos
Oakland, CA 94602	Date of Decision appealed June 13, 2017
Name of Representative (if any)	Representative's Mailing Address (For notices)
	·

Please select your ground(s) for appeal from the list below. As part of the appeal, an explanation must be provided responding to each ground for which you are appealing. Each ground for appeal listed below includes directions as to what should be included in the explanation.

- 1) There are math/clerical errors that require the Hearing Decision to be updated. (Please clearly explain the math/clerical errors.)
- 2) Appealing the decision for one of the grounds below (required):
 - a) The decision is inconsistent with OMC Chapter 8.22, Rent Board Regulations or prior decisions of the Board. (In your explanation, you must identify the Ordinance section, regulation or prior Board decision(s) and describe how the description is inconsistent.).
 - b) The decision is inconsistent with decisions issued by other Hearing Officers. (In your explanation, you must identify the prior inconsistent decision and explain how the decision is inconsistent.)
 - c) \Box The decision raises a new policy issue that has not been decided by the Board. (In your explanation, you must provide a detailed statement of the issue and why the issue should be decided in your favor.).
 - d) **The decision violates federal, state or local law.** (In your explanation, you must provide a detailed statement as to what law is violated.)
 - e) **The decision is not supported by substantial evidence.** (In your explanation, you must explain why the decision is not supported by substantial evidence found in the case record.)

For more information phone (510)-238-3721.

f)	your explant evidence you	ied a sufficient opportunity to present my claim or respond to ation, you must describe how you were denied the chance to defeat would have presented. Note that a hearing is not required in evaluated hout a hearing if sufficient facts to make the decision are not in a	end your claims and what very case. Staff may issue a
	when your un	ion denies the Owner a fair return on my investment. (You madderlying petition was based on a fair return claim. You must specificate return and attach the calculations supporting your claim.)	
h)	Other. (In	n your explanation, you must attach a detailed explanation of yo	ur grounds for appeal.)
Number of j	pages attache	rd are limited to 25 pages from each party. Please number atta ed: 11opy of your appeal on the opposing party(ies) or your	
June 30 deposited	re under pen, 20_ it with a c	alty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that 17. I placed a copy of this form, and all attached pages, ommercial carrier, using a service at least as expeditious lly prepaid, addressed to each opposing party as follows:	t on in the United States mail or
Name		Tenant: Marc Prager	
Address		95 41st Street, #202	
City, Sta	te Zip	Oakland, CA 94611	
Name			
Address			
City. Sta	te Zip		
	fare	of Jagor	June 30, 2017
SIGNAT	URE of APP	ELLANT SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE	DATE

T16-0683, Prager v. Lagos

Attachment to APPEAL of June 13, 2017 Hearing Decision

EXPLANATION

2) a) and e):

<u>Issue</u>: Is the 10-unit apartment building at 95 41st Street in Oakland exempt under the provisions of OMC Chapter 8.22.030 A. (5)?

<u>Short Answer</u>: Yes. The undisputed evidence submitted at the Rent Board Hearing established that this apartment building was entirely newly constructed, and that it received a certificate of occupancy after January 1, 1983. Appellant proved each of the elements required for exemption under the Ordinance. The hearing officer's conclusion that this building is not exempt is therefore contrary to the evidence, contrary to the law, and should be reversed.

Applicable Law:

OMC Chapter 8.22.030 A. (5) (hereinafter "Ordinance") addresses the issue of exemptions and reads:

"Types of Dwelling Units Exempt. The following dwelling units are not covered units for purposes of this chapter, ..."

"Dwelling units which were newly constructed and received a certificate of occupancy on or after January 1, 1983. ... To qualify as a newly constructed dwelling unit, the dwelling unit must be entirely newly constructed or created from space that was formerly entirely non-residential." (emphasis added)

The Ordinance sets forth that, as long as a dwelling unit was entirely newly constructed or created from space that was formerly entirely non-residential, it qualifies as a newly constructed dwelling (and exempt) unit so long as a Certificate of Occupancy is received on or after January 1, 1983.

Discussion:

The Hearing Officer acknowledged that the former structure on the property was a single-family residence (*Hearing Decision, Page 3*), that the now-existing 10-unit apartment building replaced it, and that a Certificate of Occupancy for the 10-unit apartment building was issued on June 20, **1986** (*Hearing Decision, Exhibit 3*).

Yet the hearing officer stated, "In order to qualify for a new construction exemption, the new construction must create new units from space not already being used for residential purposes." (Hearing Decision, Page 4).^[1] The Hearing Officer appears to have ignored the portion of the

^[1] Even if the Ordinance only contained this language, it's requirement was satisfied with the documents presented at the subject hearing as will be discussed hereafter.

T16-0683, Prager v. Lagos

Attachment to APPEAL of June 13, 2017 Hearing Decision

EXPLANATION

Ordinance, quoted above, providing for an exemption for a dwelling unit which is "...entirely newly constructed..." which, as will be discussed hereafter, was also proven by appellant.

The evidence before the Hearing Officer included the October 1, 1997 Application for Report of Residential Building Record (3-R Report) (*Hearing Decision, Exhibit 2*) which, on its face, refers to the **new** construction of a four-story, non-owner occupied 10-unit apartment building, and noting it to be **original construction** (1983). This evidence also established that a permit was issued on February 24, 1981 to "Demolish single family dwelling" with an "Original construction permit" issued on July 19, 1983. A Certificate of Occupancy was issued on June 20, **1986** (also in evidence before the Hearing Officer, *Hearing Decision, Exhibit 3*). It is self-evident that if a 10 unit residential apartment building sits where a single family dwelling once sat, entirely new construction took place. Thus, Appellant proved that this apartment building is exempt.

Another one of the errors made by the Hearing Officer, as reflected by her decision, was that she ignored evidence--- namely, the site plan diagram submitted by Appellant.

The "first" hearing of this matter was held on April 28, 2017. Following this hearing and its continuance to May 22, 2017 to give both sides an opportunity to produce additional evidence (see *Hearing Decision, Page 3, Footnote 4*), Appellant, on May 1, 2017 submitted a letter to the Hearing Officer (Exhibit A hereto), which **included** the noted (and more legible) Certificate of Occupancy (Hearing Decision, Exhibit 3) as well as the property's site plan diagram (see, Exhibit A, Page 5, hereto). This submission was in response to the Hearing Officer's request for the "footprint" of the previously-existing structure, i.e., a single-family dwelling. This site plan diagram includes the words "new building proposed" and confirms the footprint of the previously existing single-family dwelling (outlined in blue) was well within the confines of the larger "footprint" of the then-proposed and presently existing 10-unit building (outlined in pink). Further, the words "2 sty stucco (to be removed)" are written over the footprint of the singlefamily dwelling, clearly indicating that the old 2-story stucco residence was to be demolished. A true and correct copy of this site plan diagram submitted to the Hearing Officer on May 22, 2017, properly orientated, enlarged, and with its pertinent parts outlined/highlighted as noted above, is attached for the Board's convenience (Exhibit C hereto). [2] This evidence was uncontroverted by the tenant.

The Hearing Officer's statement that "The Owner offered no evidence to establish the size of the prior single family dwelling in order to show that the tenant's unit was outside of that footprint, and therefore new construction" (*Hearing Decision, Page 4*) not only incorrectly reads into the Ordinance language and requirements that are not there, it also indicates the Hearing Officer's

^[2] Page 5 of <u>Exhibit A hereto</u> is the same diagram depicted in <u>Exhibit B hereto</u> but was "reversed" when copied at the City's Permit Center and initially sent to the Hearing Officer on May 1, 2017. To the extent that it is later found that this particular "legible" diagram (<u>Exhibit B hereto</u>) was not made part of the record when it was provided to the Hearing Officer on May 22, 2017, request is herewith made, in the interests of justice, that it be made part of this Appeal process, or, in the alternative, an additional evidentiary hearing be ordered.

T16-0683, Prager v. Lagos

Attachment to APPEAL of June 13, 2017 Hearing Decision

EXPLANATION

conflation of the Ordinance's terms. The Ordinance does not reference, or require proof of, the size of the prior single family dwelling. While the second alternative for exemption applies to dwelling units created from "space" that was formerly entirely non-residential, that provision --- which does not require evidence of the size of the prior single family dwelling (or space) --- most importantly has no bearing on whether the property is exempt under the first alternative. These are two entirely separate, independent grounds for exemption. Appellant was only required to prove, which it did, that these 10 new apartments were all "entirely newly constructed". Clearly, the Hearing Officer was confused regarding the relevant terms of the subject Ordinance.

It is true that no documents were produced by Appellant/owners **prior** to the **first** hearing. [3] Appellant/owners **did**, however, produce, **at the first hearing**, the October 1, 1997 Application for Report of Residential Building Record (3-R Report) (*Hearing Decision, Exhibit 2*). However, it is not true that Appellant/owners produced **only** the Certificate of Occupancy prior to the second hearing. The documents that were provided **prior** to the second hearing, as set forth in *Exhibit A* hereto, consisted of, 1) a May 1, 2017 transmittal letter, 2) the June 20, 1986 Certificate of Occupancy, and, 3) the property's (reverse copied) site plan diagram already noted for the Board's present convenience as *Exhibit C* hereto.

2) d):

Appellant submits that the term(s) "footprint", "created" and/or "from space that was formerly entirely non-residential" used separately and/or together in OMC Chapter 8.22.030 A. (5)---at least insofar as these terms appear to be interpreted and applied by the Hearing Officer--- are vague, uncertain, arbitrary, overly broad, ambiguous and incapable of providing or meeting reasonable due process concerns to which United States citizens and California residents are entitled before their property, real or otherwise, is taken from them. By way of example, suppose the footprint of a previously-existing and later demolished two-story residential dwelling showed a bedroom on the first floor in the northeast corner; is a bedroom in the same northeast corner of the first floor of an entirely newly constructed ten or twenty unit apartment building not exempt because it did not create living space that did not previously exist? Such a result is illogical, absurd, impractical, unworkable, and entirely at odds with the purpose of the Ordinance.

As used in the context of building construction, a "building footprint" refers to the perimeter of the building plan. Parking lots, landscapes, and other non-building facilities are not included in such a "building footprint". A "footprint" alone says nothing about how many bedrooms existed, where they were located, and/or how many stories the structure had.

^[3] It is not true that Appellant/owners were specifically asked to "produce" the October 1, 1997 Application for Report of Residential Building Record (3-R Report) (Hearing Decision, Exhibit 2) at the first hearing but chose not to. It was "produced" and shown to everyone. It was the only document Appellant/owners had and they had no reason not to produce it if, as admitted by the Hearing Officer, Appellant/owners relied on the document at the hearing (Hearing Decision, Page 2, First Paragraph). It was not marked and placed in the evidentiary record until the May 22, 2017 hearing.

T16-0683, Prager v. Lagos

Attachment to APPEAL of June 13, 2017 Hearing Decision

EXPLANATION

Therefore, requiring a footprint of the former structure to prove either alternative basis for exemption under the "newly constructed dwelling unit" section of the Ordinance is neither logical nor practical. New construction can, and often does, follow the same footprint as the former structure, yet it is still creating entirely new dwelling units when the newly constructed apartment building replaces a single family dwelling. Thus, to the extent the Hearing Officer interpreted the Ordinance as requiring proof that Mr. Prager's unit was "new" in the sense that it is not in the same "space" as what was already being used for residential purposes in the former single-family home, is reading into the Ordinance language that does not exist, is creating a burden of proof that is virtually impossible to meet, and is contrary to the intent of the Ordinance.

One of the stated purposes of the Ordinance is, "... encouraging rehabilitation of rental units, encouraging investment in new residential rental property in the city ... " (see OMC 8.22.010 A., B., C.). However, the Hearing Officer's erroneous interpretation and application of the subject Ordinance's language is inconsistent with the purpose of the Ordinance. There would be **no incentive**, for example, to tear down a single family home and to put up a 10 unit apartment building (and thereby create new residential property that could accommodate 20 or more new renters) if the Hearing Officer's interpretation and application of the Ordinance was correct.

Finally, the Hearing Officer's Decision is inconsistent with a related provision of the Ordinance which provide for an exemption for "substantially rehabilitated buildings". If the original owners of this 10-unit apartment had simply "spent a minimum of fifty (50) percent of the average basic cost for new construction for a rehabilitation project" by turning the single family dwelling into ten apartments, the building would be exempt, regardless of whether any of the new units were "outside" of the footprint of the old structure, or whether any of the new units were created "from 'space' [] already being used for residential purposes". (*Hearing Decision*, *Page 4*).

<u>Hearing Request</u>: To the extent that Board determines that an evidentiary hearing is necessary, Appellant requests such hearing pursuant to OMC Chapter 8.22.120 B. (4).

Attestation:

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the matters stated herein.

Executed this day of June, 2017, at Oakland, Alameda County, California.

Panos Lagos

Panos Lagos

TEL. (510) 530-4078 FAX (510) 530-4725

5032 WOODMINSTER LANE OAKLAND, CA 94602 E-MAIL ADDRESS: PANOS@PANOSLAGOSLAW.COM

May 1, 2017

VIA FAX and MAIL
Barbara M. Cohen, Hearing Officer
City of Oakland
Department of Housing and Community Development
Rent Adjustment Program
P.O. Box 70243
Oakland, CA 94612-2043

Re:

File Name:

Prager v. Lagos

Property Address:

95 41st Street, #202, Oakland, CA, 94611

Case Number:

T16-0683

Dear Ms. Cohen:

Enclosed please find a copy of the "First Page", "Second Page" and "Third Page" of the June 20, 1986 Building Certificate of Occupancy, the Third Page being the most legible, as well as a diagram of the subject building.

Your attention is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF PANOS LAGOS

Alicia Hubbs, Assista

/ah

Enclosures

cc: Marc Prager (via email and regular mail)

EXHIBIT A, Page 1 of 5

GITY OF OAKLAND BUILDING CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

No				All	19
THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the GR	!OUP ∋3	TYPE	15-3 i n		∰STÖRY büildin
Q)	Marin Marine Production				which is owner
by Facility					
게 말했다면서 보고 그렇게 가르게 되었다. 일 사용하는 사람들은 보고 있다면 보다 되었다.			<i>9</i> 1.2	ov th ve r pag	
	and Clare Armini				
	in the Main a		;		
in FIRE ZONE U	SE ZONE	OHC Variance No.		_ Dated	
- Building Permit No.	<u>Pieni</u> Bu	ildii g Completion I	Date	74-77-93	has been Inspected
and the following occupancy t	hereof is hereby author	orized:			Number
		pancies:			Habitable Rooms
Cellar					
Bosement			rad sentramenta (mengalamena ya manganan a mag		
.					
1 Story	<u> iini ka Libelija</u> J	Roma Pining R	<u> Mar. Mitrica</u>	is Conduct.	<u> </u>
Story - I the laborations	- Park 1 Own Os	rans			3
Slory 3 - 1 Western	dinkui Lining	Max an Diriga 13	oon, «thomas	r Zwebe	
11-Story Eastern	Dig 64a				
Slory		the second at the second secon			
Add Story					
as necessory.					
Prior Cert. of Occup		Date		τοι	AL
Prior Cert, of Occup. void on		وبوسيس سندوسة وتستند سينت فيعفونك	Rent	al Units (Yes or N	lo)
Re-Inspr. Dales	a granderija artituska e es mes mangsanta kunda sestangsangsan kunda ba bada basa.	A think a more to an increase the state of the series		License (Yes or N	
	:- <u> </u>		e in the property of the second	an an interest	
		Bar interversing			•
$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\mathbf{v}}$					
	-	r. Chief	Building Inspector		

The Certificate of Occupancy shall not be construed as authority to violate, cancel, after ar set aside any of the provisions or requirements of any laws or ordinances of the City of Oakland nor shall such issuance thereafter prevent requiring corrections of errors or of violations of any applicable law or ordinance of the City of Oakland.

Necessary licenses shall be obtained, as this Certificate does not of itself constitute a license.

EXHIBIT A,
Page 2 of 5

CITY OF OAKLAND BUILDING CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

No.	Con Hills	Aris registyt do	Military Commence	والمنافية المستحدث والمستحدث	- 22 19 86
THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the GRO	OUP 2	TYPE	7 <u>. (1.4.3</u>	and topic	STORY buildin
. äl	orthographic and the second			egenda ar gagar a s≟egas angsatistiya	_which is owner
By Face) d			wixid to		
	9467.9				
in FIRE ZONEUS	E ZONE(DHC Variance No.	D	zled	
Building Permit No.	Buile	ding Completion D	ole	hos	been Inspected
and the following occupancy th	nereof is hereby author	zed:			Number
	Οσευρα	ncies:			Habitable Rooms
Cellar	The second secon				
Basement					
2 mi Story 2 12					
and Story 1 Toxisman.					
Story 3 - Story	Chies Chare Do	<u> Dining Sc</u>	em <u>, 163 terman Ce</u>	20,550	
Story 3 13 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15					- 9
Story		•			
Add Story as necessary					
Prior Cerl, of Occup.		the state of the s			
Prior Cert. of Occup. void on			Rental L	Inits (Yes or No)	
Re-Inspl. Dates			lice	ense (Yes or No)	
n er ef elmente, elment a un en en elegist et elmente i a un elegist et el elle el el el el el el el el el el El el		Same of the State of Same of the State of th			
		And the second s			
			Y-1/2		


The Certificate of Occupancy shall not be construed as authority to violate, cancel, after or set aside any of the provisions or requirements of any laws or ordinances of the City of Oakland nor shall such issuance thereafter prevent requiring corrections of errors or af violations of any applicable law or ordinance of the City of Oakland.


Necessary licenses shall be obtained, as this Certificate does not of itself constitute a license.

EXHIBIT A, Page 3 of 5

CITY OF OAKLAND BUILDING CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

社会各种的人。因此是社会的基础的社会的主义	SOULS.	<u> 18n Unit Ara: Coent Ve</u>	mae	itrie 201. 19
THIS IS TO CERTIFY II	nal the GROUP	TYPE	-(γ=])/(Ω	<u>-(4) Pour</u> STORY bui
	<u> 95 - 31st Street</u>			which is ov
by	datold Jorgan			
	166 Santa Clara.	Avenue	THIRD PAGE	
	Cakland, Ca 946	10		
In FIRE ZONE	USE ZONE	OHC Variance No.	Daled	
Building Permit Nor		Building Completion D	Dale	has been linspe
	cupancy thereof is her	eby authorized: Occupancies:		Númbe Habilabl Rocms
Cellar			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1000년 12일 : 10일 1일			to a contract the contract to	
일이 회사의 선생들은 학생들이 안내면 없다.		ioing Ross, Diving Ro		
		living Revel, Dining Ro		
	Microsine : Par 5			74.07 A
新。Yan Xi 医内线 从第二次事实	(A)	iving Powi Tining Ro		4
Add Story theas necessary 1				
Prior Cert of Occup		Dale		TOTAL 37
rior Cert∷ of Occup∵v	old on			(Yes or No)
				(Yes.or:No)
erneben bilder begrinde beiter die der				
		For Chief B	wilding Inspector	








EXHIBIT C 000047



P.O. BOX 70243, OAKLAND, CA 94612-2043

CITY OF OAKLAND

Department of Housing and Community Development Rent Adjustment Program

TEL (510) 238-3721 FAX (510) 238-6181 TDD (510) 238-3254

HEARING DECISION

CASE NUMBER:

T16-0683, Prager v. Lagos

PROPERTY ADDRESS:

95 41st Street, # 202, Oakland, CA

DATE OF HEARING:

April 28, 2017; May 22, 2017

DATE OF DECISION:

June 13, 2017

APPEARANCES:

Marc Prager, Tenant (both dates) Panos Lagos, Owner (both dates)

James Yamada, Owner (April 28, 2017) Craig Riesterer, Witness (April 28, 2017)

SUMMARY OF DECISION

The tenant's petition is granted in part. The legal rent for the unit is set forth in the Order below.

CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

The tenant filed a petition on December 2, 2016, contesting a rent increase from \$1,825 to \$2,200 a month, on the following grounds:

- The increase exceed the Consumer Price Index (CPI) Adjustment, is unjustified or is greater than 10%; and,
- No written notice of the Rent Program (*RAP Notice*) was given to him at least six months prior to the effective date of the rent increase.

Additionally, the tenant claimed that his housing services had decreased. The claims of decreased services involve the carpet is his unit being past its useful life.

The owner filed a timely response to the tenant petition on December 30, 2016 claiming that the unit is exempt from the RAP as new construction.

THE ISSUES

- 1. Is the unit exempt from the RAP as new construction?
- 2. When, if ever, was the RAP Notice first served on the tenant?
- 3. Can the tenant raise claims related to decreased services that were not raised in the tenant's initial filing?
- 4. Have the tenant's housing services decreased?
- 5. What is the rent and what, if any, restitution is owed between the parties?

EVIDENCE

Building History: The owners testified that they purchased the subject property in 1997.

The owners had not produced any documents to the RAP prior to the Hearing about the subject property. At the Hearing they referred to a document entitled *Application for Report of Residential Building Record*. They testified that they did not think they had a *Certificate of Occupancy*. They testified that based on the documentary record (the *Application for Report of Residential Building Record*), they believed that a single family dwelling was demolished before the current building was built. They did not own the property at the time.

The Hearing was set for a second day. The owners were asked to produce a *Certificate of Occupancy* and the *Application for Report of Residential Building Record* prior to the Hearing. They were also asked to produce any plans that might show the footprint of the prior residential unit and the footprint of the current 10 unit building. Prior to the Hearing, the owners produced only the *Certificate of Occupancy*. This document states that the building completion date was June 20, 1986, and that the building is a ten unit apartment house.¹

At the Hearing held on May 22, 2017, the owner was asked about the *Application for Report of Residential Building Record*, which was provided to the Hearing Officer at the Hearing. This document, dated October 1, 1997, shows that a permit was received in February of 1981 to "demolish (a) single family dwelling." Then in July of 1983 a permit was issued to construct a 10-unit apartment building.

The owner was also asked about whether he was able to find any plans for the previous building or the current building. He testified that he did not find any records.

¹ Exhibit 3. This document, and all other documents referred to in this Hearing Decision, was admitted into evidence without objection.

² Exhibit 2. The owners were specifically asked at the first Hearing to produce this document but chose not to. This document was admitted into evidence without objection, even though it was not produced 7 days in advance, as it had crucial information about the prior history of this property that was not available on any other document produced by the owners.

Rental History: The tenant testified that he moved into the rental unit in March of 2014, at an initial rent of \$1,825 a month. He received a rent increase notice on about November 22, 2016, purporting to increase his rent to \$2,200 (from \$1,825) a month. He has paid the old rent of \$1,825 and will continue to do so until he receives a Hearing Decision in this matter. He received the *RAP Notice* with this rent increase notice. He also received the *RAP Notice* when he moved into the building.³

The owners did not dispute the tenant's testimony about these issues.

<u>Decreased Housing Services</u>: The tenant testified that the carpet is old, worn and smells. It is not a tripping hazard. The carpet was in the same condition when he moved in. The tenant produced photographs of the carpet, which show minor staining.⁴

The owner Panos Lagos testified that at the time that he rented the unit to the tenant it was in fine shape. The carpet was not worn and it did not smell. When he got notice of the tenant's complaint, he returned to the unit to see the carpet in February of 2017. The carpet was in fine shape, there is no tripping hazard, it is not worn and does not smell.

Official Notice is taken that on April 20, 2017, (prior to the first Hearing in this case) the tenant produced a letter to the RAP seeking to add additional claims regarding decreased services in this case. The tenant was not permitted to testify about these matters (See below.)

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Is the unit exempt from the RAP as new construction?

The Oakland Rent Adjustment Ordinance states that dwelling units are not "covered units" under the Ordinance if such units "were newly constructed and received a certificate of occupancy on or after January 1, 1983." The Ordinance states:

"To qualify as a newly constructed dwelling unit, the dwelling unit must be entirely newly constructed or created from space that was formerly entirely non-residential."

An owner has the burden of proof on all elements of a claim for exemption.

In this case, the owner purchased a 10 unit residential building in 1997. The evidence documents that prior to the 10 unit residential building being built, which was in 1986, a prior residential single family dwelling existed on the property.

³ Exhibit 1.

⁴ Exhibit 4. These documents were produced by the tenant prior to the second Hearing. The tenant was given an opportunity to produce additional evidence, since the owner was being given the opportunity to produce additional evidence.

⁵ O.M.C. § 8.22.030(A)(5)

⁶ O.M.C. § 8.22.030(A)(5)

The owner offered no evidence to establish the size of the prior single family dwelling in order to show that the tenant's unit was outside of that footprint, and therefore new construction.

Furthermore, this building was built before *Costa Hawkins*, California Civil Code § 1954.50 et seq. was enacted. While *Costa Hawkins* does state that newly constructed units are exempt if they have a *Certificate of Occupancy* issued after February 1, 1995, or were already exempt from rent control pursuant to a local exemption for newly constructed units, *Costa Hawkins* is not controlling here since the *Certificate of Occupancy* was issued before February 1, 1995.

In order to qualify for a new construction exemption, the new construction must create new units from space not already being used for residential purposes. Since the owners did not provide any evidence as to the footprint of the prior residential building, there is no way to establish that the tenant's unit is new construction.

Therefore, the owners have not met their burden of proof to establish that the subject building is exempt from the Rent Adjustment Ordinance as new construction.

When, if ever, was the RAP Notice first served on the tenant?

The Rent Adjustment Ordinance (Ordinance) requires an owner to serve the *RAP Notice* at the start of a tenancy ⁷ and together with any notice of rent increase or change in the terms of a tenancy.⁸ An owner can cure the failure to give notice at the start of the tenancy, but may not raise the rent until 6 months after the first *RAP Notice* is given.⁹

The tenant was served with the *RAP Notice* when he moved into the unit.

Can the tenant raise claims related to decreased services that were not raised in the tenant's initial filing?

In order to bring a claim of decreased housing services, the tenant is required to provide a list or a description of his claims when he files his petition. O.M.C. § 8.22.070 (F). Here the tenant filed a list of decreased housing services with his petition, which raised only an issue related to the carpet.

Approximately a week prior to the initial Hearing, the tenant sent a letter to the RAP office seeking to add additional claims of decreased services to his petition. This document was filed on April 20, 2017. Since this list was not provided with the tenant's initial petition, these issues were not considered at the Hearing. Only those issues that were on the documents the tenant initially filed were considered at the Hearing.

///

⁷ O.M.C. § 8.22.060(A)

⁸ O.M.C. § 8.22.070(H)(1)(A)

⁹ O.M.C.§ 8.22.060 (C)

Have the tenant's housing services decreased?

Under the Oakland Rent Adjustment Ordinance, a decrease in housing services is considered to be an increase in rent¹⁰ and may be corrected by a rent adjustment.¹¹ However, in order to justify a decrease in rent, a decrease in housing services must be the loss of a service that seriously affects the habitability of a unit or one that was provided at the beginning of the tenancy that is no longer being provided.

In a decreased housing services case tenants must establish that they have given the owner notice of the problems and the opportunity to fix the problems before they are entitled to relief.

In this case the tenant complained of the condition of the carpet. Both the owner and the tenant testified that the carpet is in essentially the same condition as it was when the tenant moved into the unit; therefore, there is not a changed condition. Furthermore, there is no proof that there is any habitability violation with respect to the carpet—there are no holes, no mold and no tripping hazards.

The tenant has established only that there are some stains on the carpet. Stains are not a habitability problem. This claim is denied.

What is the rent and what, if any, restitution is owed between the parties?

The owners did not seek to justify the rent increase other than claiming new construction. Since the owners have not prevailed in their claim of new construction, the rent remains \$1,825 a month. The tenant has not paid the rent increase. Therefore, there are no underpayments or overpayments.

ORDER

- 1. Petition T16-0683 is granted in part. The rent remains \$1,825.
- 2. The tenant's claims of decreased services are denied.
- 3. The unit is not exempt from the RAP as new construction.
- 4. Right to Appeal: This decision is the final decision of the Rent Adjustment **Program Staff.** Either party may appeal this decision by filing a properly completed appeal using the form provided by the Rent Adjustment Program. The appeal must be received within twenty (20) calendar days after service of the decision. The date of

///		
///		

¹⁰ O.M.C. § 8.22.070(F) ¹¹ O.M.C. § 8.22.110(E)

service is shown on the attached Proof of Service. If the Rent Adjustment Office is closed on the last day to file, the appeal may be filed on the next business day.

Dated: June 13, 2017

Barbara M. Cohen

Hearing Officer Rent Adjustment Program TU-0680 10 80

CITY OF OAKLAND

RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mail To: P. O. Box 70243

Oakland, California 94612-0243

(510) 238-3721

Please print legibly

For date stamp.		
·	080-2216	

CARLAND RENE ALL CONCRE

<u>Please Fill Out This Form As Completely As You Can</u>. Failure to provide needed information may result in your petition being rejected or delayed.

TENANT PETITION

Your Name	Re	ental A	ddress (with zip code) 94	Telephone	
Marc PRAGE	$c_{\mathcal{O}}$	15	41st St.	5/09133080	
Marc I NUPE	K	okla.	1 Apt. 202		
Your Representative's Name			Address (with zip code)	Telephone	
1 our representative sivarile	. 171	iaimig 1	Address (with zip code)	1 elephone	
Property Owner(s) name(s)	M	failing .	Address (with zip code)	Telephone	
0. (1.	6	503:	2 Woodmin (te-	Ln Co	
Panos Lago	3	Och	land 94602	Ln. 510 530 4078	
J		UMF	1900 C	330	
Number of units on the pro	pperty:		·		
Type of unit you rent (circle one)	House		Condominium	Apartment) Room, or Live-Work	
Are you current on your rent? (circle one)	Yes		No	Legally Withholding Rent. You must attach an explanation and citation of code violation.	
grounds for a petition see (OMC 8.22.070	and O	OMC 8.22.090. I (We)	neck at least one box. For all of the ontest one or more rent increases on	
one or more of the follow		A dinot	tmont and is (ana) univerti	fied or is (are) greater than 10%.	
				he increase despite my written request.	
			it was vacated (Costa-Ha		
				the notice of increase(s) I am	
contesting. (Only for in				the house of mercase(s) fam	
				am was not given to me at least six	
	months before the effective date of the rent increase(s) I am contesting.				
(f1) The housing service	(f1) The housing services I am being provided have decreased. (Complete Section III on following page)				
4 - 4				plation in the unit. If the owner has been	
cited in an inspection report, please attach a copy of the citation or report.					
			t increase in a 12-month		
(h) The notice of rent i	ncrease based	upon c	capital improvement cost	s does not contain the "enhanced	
				ced notice was not filed with the RAP.	
				crease based on capital improvements.	
				0% in 5 years. (The 5-year period	
begins with rent increas					
(k) I wish to contest an exemption from the Rent Adjustment Ordinance (OMC 8.22, Article I)					

	HISTORY: (You into the Unit: 3				1825	ĵ. 02	/month
When did the ov Adjustment Prog	vner first provide y gram (RAP NOTIC fo subsidized or contr reases that you w onal space, please	ou with a writt (E)? Date:	ten NOTICE TO Lower 26/16 overnment agen ge. Begin with	TENANTS If never	of the exist or provided, g HUD (Sec	tence of the enter "Nevertion 8)? York backwa	rer." Yes No ards. If
Date Notice Served (mo/day/year)	Date Increase Effective (mo/day/year)	Amount Re	ent Increased	Are you C this Increa Petiti	ase in this	Did You I Rent Pr Notice V Notic	rogram Vith the ce Of
11/20/18	10/1/10	From \$ 1 \(\forall 7 \)	To S	X Yes	□ No	Incre VYes	ase?
11124 16	12/1/17	\$ 1825	2200	Yes	I No	1 Yes	No
		\$	\$	Yes	I No	I Yes	□ No
		\$	\$	□ Yes	10 No	1 Yes	No No
		\$	\$	Yes	□ No	Yes	
		\$					□ No
		3	\$	☐ Yes	□ No	1 Yes	□ No
existence of the F If you never got to List case number III. DESCRIP Decreased or in	Rent Adjustment protection (Appendix Adjustment protection (Appendix Appendix Append	ogram (whiche can contest all s) you have ev REASED OF services are	ver is later) to copast increases. er filed for this for	ontest a rent in the rental unit: ATE HOUS increase in rental arease in r	SING SEF	O.M.C. 8.22.0 	090 A 2)
Have you lost se	harged for services ervices originally p g any serious prob	rovided by the	owner or have	the condition		□ Yes □ Yes ☑Yes	*B-No
reduced service service(s) or se service(s); and	d "Yes" to any o e(s) and problem(s) rious problem(s) 3) how you calc vidence if available	s). Be sure to ; 2) the date ulate the doll	include at leas the loss(es) be	t the follow gan or the	ing: 1) a li date you l	ist of the lo began payi	st housin ng for th

To have a unit inspected and code violations cited, contact the City of Oakland, Code Compliance Unit, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor, Oakland, CA 94612. Phone: (510) 238-3381

IV. VERIFICATION: The tenant must sign: I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California that everything I said in this petition is true and that all of the documents attached to the petition are true copies of the originals. V. MEDIATION AVAILABLE: Mediation is an entirely voluntary process to assist you in reaching an agreement with the owner. If both parties agree, you have the option to mediate your complaints before a hearing is held. If the parties do not reach an agreement in mediation, your case will go to a formal hearing before a Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officer the same day. You may choose to have the mediation conducted by a Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officer or select an outside mediator. Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officers conduct mediation sessions free of charge. If you and the owner agree to an outside mediator, please call (510) 238-3721 to make arrangements. Any fees charged by an outside mediator for mediation of rent disputes will be the responsibility of the parties requesting the use of their services. Mediation will be scheduled only if both parties agree (after both your petition and the owner's response have been filed with the Rent Adjustment Program). The Rent Adjustment Program will not schedule a mediation session if the owner does not file a response to the petition. Rent Board Regulation 8.22.100.A. If you want to schedule your case for mediation, sign below, I agree to have my case mediated by a Rent Adjustment Program Staff Hearing Officer (no charge).

VI. IMPORTANT INFORMATION:

Tenant's Signature

<u>Time to File</u> This form must be **received** at the offices of the City of Oakland, Rent Adjustment Program, Dalziel Building, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza Suite 5313, Oakland, CA 94612 within the time limit for filing a petition set out in the Rent Adjustment Ordinance, Oakland Municipal Code, Chapter 8.22. Board Staff cannot grant an extension of time to file your petition by phone. For more information, please call: (510) 238-3721.

Date

File Review

The owner is required to file a Response to this petition within 35 days of notification by the Rent Adjustment Program. You will be mailed a copy of the Landlord's Response form. Copies of **documents attached** to the Response form will not be sent to you. However, you may review these in the Rent Program office by appointment. For an appointment to review a file call (510) 238-3721; please allow six weeks from the date of filing before scheduling a file review.

VII. HOW DID YOU LEARN ABOUT THE RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM?

	Printed form provided by the owner
	Pamphlet distributed by the Rent Adjustment Program
	Legal services or community organization
	Sign on bus or bus shelter
X	Other (describe): Interpet

IV. VERIFICATION: The tenant must sign: I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California that everything I said in this petition is true and that all of the documents attached to the petition are true copies of the originals. 11/28/16 V. MEDIATION AVAILABLE: Mediation is an entirely voluntary process to assist you in reaching an agreement with the owner. If both parties agree, you have the option to mediate your complaints before a hearing is held. If the parties do not reach an agreement in mediation, your case will go to a formal hearing before a Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officer the same day. You may choose to have the mediation conducted by a Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officer or select an outside mediator. Rent Adjustment Program Hearing Officers conduct mediation sessions free of charge. If you and the owner agree to an outside mediator, please call (510) 238-3721 to make arrangements. Any fees charged by an outside mediator for mediation of rent disputes will be the responsibility of the parties requesting the use of their services. Mediation will be scheduled only if both parties agree (after both your petition and the owner's response have been filed with the Rent Adjustment Program). The Rent Adjustment Program will not schedule a mediation session if the owner does not file a response to the petition. Rent Board Regulation 8.22.100.A. If you want to schedule your case for mediation, sign below. I agree to have my case mediated by a Rent Adjustment Program Staff Hearing Officer (no charge). Tenant's Signature VI. IMPORTANT INFORMATION: Time to File This form must be received at the offices of the City of Oakland, Rent Adjustment Program, Dalziel Building, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza Suite 5313, Oakland, CA 94612 within the time limit for filing a petition set out in the Rent Adjustment Ordinance, Oakland Municipal Code, Chapter 8.22. Board Staff cannot grant an extension of time to file your petition by phone. For more information, please call: (510) 238-3721. File Review The owner is required to file a Response to this petition within 35 days of notification by the Rent Adjustment Program. You will be mailed a copy of the Landlord's Response form. Copies of documents attached to the Response form will not be sent to you. However, you may review these in the Rent Program office by appointment. For an appointment to review a file call (510) 238-3721; please allow six weeks from the date of filing before scheduling a file review. VII. HOW DID YOU LEARN ABOUT THE RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM? Printed form provided by the owner Pamphlet distributed by the Rent Adjustment Program Legal services or community organization

Sign on bus or bus shelter
Other (describe): Interpret

Reduced Services
Carpet is past its useful life and should be replaced.

JM -

CITY OF OAKLAND RENT ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

P.O. Box 70243 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 5313 Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 238-3721 For filing stamp.

DEC 3 8 20x

DAKLAND RENT ALLOSTMEN

<u>Please Fill Out This Form As Completely As You Can</u>. Failure to provide needed information may result in your response being rejected or delayed.

Case Number T 16-0683 / Pr	rager v. Lagos <u>OW</u>	NER RESPONSE
Please print legibly.		
Your Name PANOS LAGOS	Complete Address (with zip code) LAW OFFICES OF PANOS LAGOS 5032 Woodminster Lane Oakland, CA 94602	Phone: 510 530 4078 Email: panos@panoslagoslaw.com
Your Representative's Name (if any)	Complete Address (with zip code)	Phone: Fax: Email:
Tenant(s) name(s)	Complete Address (with zip code)	
MARC PRAGER	95 41st Street, Apt. 202 Oakland, CA 94611	
(Provide proof of payment.) There are 10 residential units Is there more than one street address	EXHIBIT A Program Service Fee? (\$30 per unit) Yes (in the subject building. I acquired the bui	□ No 🖬
The tenant moved into the rental uni	t on <u>or about 3/1/2014</u>	
The tenant's initial rent including all	services provided was \$_1,825.00 / r	month.
RESIDENTIAL RENT ADJUSTM	en the City of Oakland's form entitled NOTENT PROGRAM ("RAP Notice") to all yes, on what date was the Notice first give	of the petitioning tenants?
Is the tenant current on the rent? Ye	s_X_No	3
If you believe your unit is exempt from	om Rent Adjustment you may skip to <u>Secti</u>	on IV. EXEMPTION.

Rev. 2/25/15

1

to the RAP office no capital improv	e within 10 days of evements increase.	serving the tenant	Did you submit ?? Yes No	. Not applicable	e: there was
Begin with the n	nost recent rent in	crease and work	k backwards. Attach	n another sheet if n	eeded.
Date Notice Given (mo/day/year)	Date Increase Effective (mo/day/year)	Amount	Rent Increased	Did you provid TO TENANTS notice of rent i	with the
		\$	\$	□ Yes	□No
. ,		\$	\$	□Yes	□No
		\$	\$	□ Yes	□No
		\$	-\$	☐ Yes	□No
	1.	\$	\$	☐ Yes	□No

If a contested increase was based on Capital Improvements, did you provide an Enhanced Notice to Tenants for Capital Improvements to the petitioning tenant(s)? Yes _____ No ____ . If yes, on what

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR RENT INCREASE

You must prove that each contested rent increase greater than the Annual CPI Adjustment is justified and was correctly served. Use the following table and check the applicable justification(s) box for each increase contested by the tenant(s) petition. For a summary of these justifications, please refer to the "Justifications for Increases Greater than the Annual CPI Rate" section in the attached Owner's Guide to Rent Adjustment.

<u>Date of</u> Increase	Banking (deferred annual increases_)	Increased Housing Service Costs	Capital Improve- ments	Uninsured Repair Costs	Fair Return	Debt Service (if purchased before 4/1/14)
	· 🗆					
					. 🗆	
					<u> </u>	

For each justification checked, you must submit organized documents demonstrating your entitlement to the increase. Please see the "Justifications" section in the attached Owner's Guide for details on the type of documentation required. In the case of Capital Improvement increases, you must include a copy of the "Enhanced Notice to Tenants for Capital Improvements" that was given to tenants. Your supporting documents do not need to be attached here, but are due in the RAP office no later than seven (7) days before the first scheduled Hearing date.

□ Yes

□ No

III. DECREASED HOU. G SERVICES

If the petition filed by your tenant claims Decreased Housing Services, state your position regarding the tenant's claim(s) of decreased housing services on a separate sheet. Submit any documents, photographs or other tangible evidence that supports your position.

IV. EXEMPTION

If you claim that your property is exempt from Rent Adjustment (Oakland Municipal Code Chapter 8.22), please check one or more of the grounds:

- The unit is a single family residence or condominium exempted by the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (California Civil Code 1954.50, et seq.). If claiming exemption under Costa-Hawkins, please answer the following questions on a separate sheet:
 - 1. Did the prior tenant leave after being given a notice to quit (Civil Code Section 1946)?
 - 2. Did the prior tenant leave after being given a notice of rent increase (Civil Code Section 827)?
 - 3. Was the prior tenant evicted for cause?
 - 4. Are there any outstanding violations of building housing, fire or safety codes in the unit or building?
 - 5. Is the unit a single family dwelling or condominium that can be sold separately?
 - 6. Did the petitioning tenant have roommates when he/she moved in?
 - 7. If the unit is a condominium, did you purchase it? If so: 1) from whom? 2) Did you purchase the entire building?
- The rent for the unit is controlled, regulated or subsidized by a governmental unit, agency or authority other than the City of Oakland Rent Adjustment Ordinance.
- X The unit was newly constructed and a certificate of occupancy was issued for it on or after January 1, 1983.
- On the day the petition was filed, the tenant petitioner was a resident of a motel, hotel, or boarding house for less than 30 days.
- The subject unit is in a building that was rehabilitated at a cost of 50% or more of the average basic cost of new construction.
- The unit is an accommodation in a hospital, convent, monastery, extended care facility, convalescent home, non-profit home for aged, or dormitory owned and operated by an educational institution.
- The unit is located in a building with three or fewer units. The owner occupies one of the units continuously as his or her principal residence and has done so for at least one year.

V. IMPORTANT INFORMATION

Time to File. This form must be received by the Rent Adjustment Program, P.O. Box 70243, Oakland, CA 94612-0243, within 35 days of the date that a copy of the Tenant Petition was mailed to you. (The date of mailing is shown on the Proof of Service attached to the Tenant Petition and other response documents mailed to you.) A postmark does not suffice. If the RAP office is closed on the last day to file, the time to file is extended to the next day the office is open. If you wish to deliver your completed Owner Response to the Rent Adjustment Program office in person, go to the City of Oakland Housing Assistance Center, 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor, Oakland, where you can date-stamp and drop your Response in the Rent Adjustment drop box. The Housing Assistance Center is open Monday through Friday, except holidays, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. You cannot get an extension of time to file your Response by telephone.

NOTE: If you do not file a timely Response, you will not be able to produce evidence at the Hearing, unless you can show good cause for the late filing.

<u>File Review.</u> You should have received a copy of the petition (and claim of decreased services) filed by your tenant with this packet. Other documents provided by the tenant will not be mailed to you. You may review additional documents in the RAP office by appointment. For an appointment to review a file or to request a copy of documents in the file call (510) 238-3721.

VI. VERIFICATION

Owner must sign here:

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws made in this Response are true and that all of the do	
the originals.	realition and the express of
and Lagor	12/22/16
Owner's Signature	Date
VII. MEDIATION AVAILABLE	
Your tenant may have signed the mediation section in t disputed issues. Mediation is an entirely voluntary proce the disputed issues in lieu of a Rent Adjustment hearing.	
If the parties reach an agreement during the mediation, a verby the mediator and signed by the parties at that time. If the go to a formal Rent Adjustment Program Hearing, usual staff Hearing Officer serves as mediator unless the parties outside mediator. If you and the tenant(s) agree to use and (510) 238-3721. Any fees charged by an outside mediate responsibility of the parties requesting the use of their set Officer to mediate a RAP case.)	the parties fail to settle the dispute, the case will lly the same day. A Rent Adjustment Program is choose to have the mediation conducted by an outside mediator, please notify the RAP office at actor for mediation of rent disputes will be the
Mediation will be scheduled only if both parties request in Response have been filed with the Rent Adjustment Progreschedule a mediation session if the owner does not Regulation 8.22.100.A.)	ram. The Rent Adjustment Program will not
If you want to schedule your case for mediation,	sign below.
I agree to have my case mediated by a Rent Adju (no charge).	stment Program Staff Hearing Officer
Owner's Signature	Date