

Communication from Public

Name: Geary J Johnson

Date Submitted: 05/10/2026 09:47 PM

Council File No: 23-0459-S3


Comments for Public Posting: 23-0459-S3. COMMUNICATION FROM THE LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY (DBS) relative to the application and acceptance of Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27 California Department of Resources Recycling and...THIS MATTER IS OPPOSED. May 13, 2025 to submission Public agenda comment city of Los Angeles . Commentary on the pictures. Thomas Khammar, Brian Vasquez, Ben Renkainen have previously said there are no available parking stalls. This is disputed by the photos—the picture showing stalls five through eight indicate that there's a car parked in stall 6 to 7. Being that that car is parked in two stalls, it clearly means that stall number six is available. It has been like that for weeks so Thomas Khammar is a liar on that issue and he has made a false statement for purposes of denying me as a Black person with the disability, a tandem and accessible parking stall and also in retaliation because I complained. Second, there's a picture of stalls 13 to 16 ; prior to this picture being taken, Khammar said that there were no stalls available on the property. Weeks ago stalls 13 and 14 have been vacant. 15 was also vacant for weeks before this picture was taken. Since Khammar already said that there were not any available parking stalls, tandem included, then how did a car end up in stall number 15? Again, Khammar is not telling the truth on this issue and his company does so for purposes of retaliation because I complained. The car sitting in stall number 15 was not there at the time that Khammar said there was no available stalls but at the same time Thomas Khammar indicated that I would be first come first serve and then I would have to file an application so apparently whoever is in stall15 never filled out an application because that application also was not given to me and yet without an application that car in stall number 15 is allowed to park there. Such discrimination as being allowed under the jurisdiction of the ADA, under the jurisdiction of HUD and under the jurisdiction of the city government of Los Angeles because these parking stalls need to have the numbers painted that is an ADA jurisdiction of which the city government code enforcement is supposed to enforce, but due to purposes of racism and retaliation against me they are not doing so. I have other pictures to show that stalls number 13 and 14 have been vacant for a long time and of course Thomas, and Ben and Brian have been lying for a long time. Power Property Management Inc. is licensed by the city of Los Angeles. Third, the picture of the front of the building shows that there is no signage to explain how to use the AKUVOX door entry Intercom system, an accessibility requirement. The owner of the property as well as the city code enforcement department refuse to make the building handicap accessible. Blacks should be afraid in that building due to auto vandalism by white plantation owner Hi Point 1522 LLC. The civil code section 1954 notice is being used for the purpose of harassment. I ask that the city housing department rule against the landlord and charge them \$5000 for the harassment that is occurring and I also ask that the city of Los Angeles, penalize the owner to the tune of \$1 million (one million) dollars as the owner acts in concert with Mayor Karen Bass, and the city Council. The city government continually acts in favor of the million dollar landlords to the detriment of the tenants. <https://lahousingpermitsandrentadjustmentcommission.com/governor-and-mayor-candidates-2026-told-of-abuse-of-federal-funds-in-los-angeles-agenda-public-comment-26-0540/>. How the Los Angeles city government treats the disabled Black. Mayor Karen Bass supports the modern day lynching of tenants by the corporate landlords. Tenants have no rights under Mayor Karen Bass. https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2025/25-0416_PC_PM_03-21-2026.pdf . “This torturous situation which was conduct by the respondents is meant to harm me and retaliation because I complained. They might as well just string me up and lynch me on the front lawn, cut my body up in small pieces, disembowel me and just spread my blood all over the front sidewalk because that really is the intent of the respondents and their racist torturous tirade of retaliation.” As seen in city Los Angeles documents. Racism Violence and Parking at 1522 Hi Point St Apts Los Angeles 90035. <https://lahousingpermitsandrentadjustmentcommission.com/racism-violence-and-parking-at-1522-hi-point-st-apts-los-angeles-90035/>



Davey G Juanvaldez · 8 years ago

31,497 views

LADBS
3.4 ⭐ · Government office



PROUDLY MANAGED BY
POWER PROPERTY
Management
Power & Technology Real Estate & Property Services
CALL FOR MORE INFO: 310 593 3955
POWERPROPERTYMANAGEMENT.COM

BUSINESS HOURS
MON - FRI
9:00AM - 5:00PM
SAT - SUN
CLOSED
ON SITE MANAGER:
BRIAN VASQUEZ
(310) 218-8499
Unit #12



White tenants are denied housing services intercom indoor monitor or interface by the property owner acting in concert with Mayor Karen Bass

Black tenants are denied housing services intercom indoor monitor or interface by the property owner acting in concert with Mayor Karen Bass

The **Unruh Civil Rights Act** (California Civil Code Section 51) prohibits housing providers, including apartment owners and managers, from discriminating against tenants or applicants based on protected characteristics, including race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, and sexual orientation. It applies to nearly all business establishments, including apartment buildings, preventing both intentional discrimination and arbitrary, unreasonable rules.

“This torturous situation which was conduct by the respondents is meant to harm me and retaliation because I complained. They might as well just string me up and lynch me on the front lawn, cut my body

up in small pieces,
disembowel me and just
spread my blood all over
the front sidewalk
because that really is the
intent of the respondents
and their racist torturous
tirade of retaliation.”

Blackman. As seen in
city Los Angeles
government documents.



May 09, 2026 10:56:51 PM



May 09, 2026 10:56:18 PM

Thomas Khammar
Brent Parsons
Brian Vasquez
Ben Renkainen |
Power Property
Management group

Are

Racists Among Us

<https://www.yelp.com/biz/power-property-management-los-angeles>

Do not hire
Power
Property
Management

Pictures. Re: May 8, 2026. Re reasonable accommodations and ADA requirements not provided. City abuse of federal funds

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: alan.christensen@lacity.org; vasquezbrian79@gmail.com; marke.bridge@lacity.org; vatche.kasumyan@lacity.org; germain.mendoza@lacity.org; oigcompl@lapd.online; steven.harrison@lacity.org; councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org; bob.blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; cd10@lacity.org; councilmember.park@lacity.org; councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.jurado@lacity.org; councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org; lahd.rso.central@lacity.org; lahd.reap@lacity.org; controller.mejia@lacity.org; dod.contact@lacity.org; aoa.crsa@aoausa.com; aram.avedisian@lacity.org; eric.bane@lacity.org; doran.bobadilla@lacity.org; laura.zimmerman@lacity.org; grant.woods@lacity.org; sewada.zadoorian@lacity.org; jason.wilson@lacity.org; kelly.warner@lacity.org; mark.wang@lacity.org; gavin@gavinnewsom.com; fabian.gonzalez@lacity.org; ramazanali.almasi@lacity.org; kevin.brown@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; rene.flores@lacity.org; 09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us; thomas@powerpropertygrp.com; brent@powerpropertygrp.com; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com; phillip.munguia@lacity.org

Cc: lamayornews@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Friday, May 8, 2026 at 08:06 PM PDT

Pictures

Front door with no signage.

Parking lot showing stalls 13 to 16, to our vacant, and the other two cannot verify parking assignments. This is contrast it with Thomas Khammar who said there was no vacant stalls available which from the pictures you can see he is not telling the truth.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

On Friday, May 8, 2026 at 07:53:41 PM PDT, G Johnson <tainmount@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

May 8, 2026

lahd.reap@lacity.org.

Request to city Los Angeles REAP department to put building into escrow for rent payments due to nonworking Intercom

system

Via facsimile and email

Dear Property owner Hi Point 1522 LLC and Power Property Mgmt Inc:

This building does not comply with the ADA standards, and applicable state building and city building code and health and safety codes as regards the AKUVOX video door phone , and entry Intercom system.

I refer to chapter 7 of the ADA section 703 and section 708. This section requires signage on the outside of the building describing how the Akuvox door entry Intercom system is to be accessed and also if sections of it are not usable. There's no signage on the outside of this building. See attached picture.

In addition, the device on the outside of the building has no interface connection to each unit which is required under local building code section 708.4 section 708.1270 8.4 as required and visual connection to each residential unit. City Building code 11 B – 708–1 thru 708.4. These failures to comply with code have existed in this building since around May 2023, as reported to city code enforcement repeatedly.

Please provide the signage to the front of the building as required. Please provide the interface or indoor monitor for each unit as required by the applicable building and/or health and safety codes, or ADA. There are 18 one bedroom units in this building.

I realize that this building receives public financing or assistance through the section 8 program and/or through the HUD voucher program.

I am asking the city government to place this building into the REAP program until such time these housing services here in are provided. Under REAP, I request that the city order all rent to be paid into an escrow account until such time here in repairs are made to the property. The owner should be ordered to inform all tenants to pay their rent into the escrow account.

It is my belief that the ADA applies to this building because the owner made major renovations in 2014 and also installed the AKUVOX system in 2023.

The lack of such housing services stated here in represent a barrier to me, such a barrier that is prohibited under the ADA.

The REAP program has jurisdiction because the Intercom AKUVOX system at the front of the building applies to tenants of all 18 units.

The Intercom system has previously been cited by the Los Angeles county code enforcement inspector as well as the Los Angeles code enforcement department concerning the Intercom system.

The city REAP program is asked to respond in writing.

Geary J. Johnson, tenant

1522 Hi Point Street 9

Los Angeles, CA. 90035

A disabled Black male American citizen

Reference PC agenda https://cityclerk.lacity.org/online/docs/2026/26-0540_PC_PM_05-04-2026.pdf

ADA (redacted)

708 Two-Way Communication Systems

708.1 General. Two-way communication systems shall comply with 708.

Advisory 708.1 General. Devices that do not require handsets are easier to use by people who have a limited reach.

708.2 Audible and Visual Indicators. The system shall provide both audible and visual signals.

Advisory 708.2 Audible and Visual Indicators. A light can be used to indicate visually that assistance is on the way. Signs indicating the meaning of visual signals should be provided.

708.3 Handsets. Handset cords, if provided, shall be 29 inches (735 mm) long minimum.

708.4 Residential Dwelling Unit Communication Systems. Communications systems between a residential dwelling unit and a site, building, or floor entrance shall comply with 708.4.

708.4.1 Common Use or Public Use System Interface. The common use or public use system interface shall include the capability of supporting voice and TTY communication with the residential dwelling unit interface.

708.4.2 Residential Dwelling Unit Interface. The residential dwelling unit system interface shall include a telephone jack capable of supporting voice and TTY communication with the common use or public use system interface

From Akuvox website

The Akuvox E16 is a feature-packed video door phone with facial recognition, access control, temperature, mask detection and more

This 5 inch facial recognition door phone designed for commercial and residential applications. Featuring touchless building access, wireless communication, 1 output relay, Wiegand, RS485, TF card slot, a camera, built-in reader, and a 20,000 face and card capacity on its 7-inch touch screen display, it ensures excellent intercom communication and versatile access control.

Specifications

- 5" Touch Screen
- Dual Cameras
- Facial Recognition
- NFC
- RFID
- Bluetooth
- Expandable for Temperature Detection
- IP65

WiFi addresses at this property

Hi-Point-General
Hi-Point-Guest
Hi-Point-Residents

Attach
Picture front door Akuvox - no signage
Picture of parking stalls 13-16 dated

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



2026-6-8 Front 1522 no signage.jpg
3.1 MB



2026-5-8 stalls 13-26 at 1522 Hi Point.jpg
1.8 MB

May 8, 2026. Re reasonable accommodations and ADA requirements not provided. City abuse of federal funds

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: alan.christensen@lacity.org; vasquezbrian79@gmail.com; marke.bridge@lacity.org; vatche.kasumyan@lacity.org; germain.mendoza@lacity.org; oigcompl@lapd.online; steven.harrison@lacity.org; councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org; bob.blumenfeld@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; cd10@lacity.org; councilmember.park@lacity.org; councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.jurado@lacity.org; councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org; lahd.rso.central@lacity.org; lahd.reap@lacity.org; controller.mejia@lacity.org; dod.contact@lacity.org; aoa.crsa@aoausa.com; aram.avedisian@lacity.org; eric.bane@lacity.org; doran.bobadilla@lacity.org; laura.zimmerman@lacity.org; grant.woods@lacity.org; sewada.zadoorian@lacity.org; jason.wilson@lacity.org; kelly.warner@lacity.org; mark.wang@lacity.org; gavin@gavinnewsom.com; fabian.gonzalez@lacity.org; ramazanali.almasi@lacity.org; kevin.brown@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; rene.flores@lacity.org; 09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us; thomas@powerpropertygrp.com; brent@powerpropertygrp.com; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com; phillip.munguia@lacity.org

Cc: lamayornews@lacity.org; lahd.reap@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Friday, May 8, 2026 at 07:53 PM PDT

May 8, 2026

lahd.reap@lacity.org.

Request to city Los Angeles REAP department to put building into escrow for rent payments due to nonworking Intercom system

Via facsimile and email

Dear Property owner Hi Point 1522 LLC and Power Property Mgmt Inc:

This building does not comply with the ADA standards, and applicable state building and city building code and health and safety codes as regards the AKUVOX video door phone , and entry Intercom system.

I refer to chapter 7 of the ADA section 703 and section 708. This section requires signage on the outside of the building describing how the Akuvox door entry Intercom system is to be accessed and also if sections of it are not usable. There's no signage on the outside of this building. See attached picture.

In addition, the device on the outside of the building has no interface connection to each unit which is required under local building code section 708.4 section 708.1270 8.4 as required and visual connection to each residential unit. City Building code 11 B – 708–1 thru 708.4. These failures to comply with code have existed in this building since around May 2023, as reported to city code enforcement repeatedly.

Please provide the signage to the front of the building as required. Please provide the interface or indoor monitor for each unit as required by the applicable building and/or health and safety codes, or ADA. There are 18 one bedroom units in this building.

I realize that this building receives public financing or assistance through the section 8 program and/or through the HUD voucher program.

I am asking the city government to place this building into the REAP program until such time these housing services here in are provided. Under REAP, I request that the city order all rent to be paid into an escrow account until such time here in repairs are made to the property. The owner should be ordered to inform all tenants to pay their rent into the escrow account.

It is my belief that the ADA applies to this building because the owner made major renovations in 2014 and also installed the AKUVOX system in 2023.

The lack of such housing services stated here in represent a barrier to me, such a barrier that is prohibited under the ADA.

The REAP program has jurisdiction because the Intercom AKUVOX system at the front of the building applies to tenants of all 18 units.

The Intercom system has previously been cited by the Los Angeles county code enforcement inspector as well as the Los Angeles code enforcement department concerning the Intercom system.

The city REAP program is asked to respond in writing.

Geary J. Johnson, tenant

1522 Hi Point Street 9

Los Angeles, CA. 90035

A disabled Black male American citizen

Reference PC agenda https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0540_PC_PM_05-04-2026.pdf

ADA (redacted)

708 Two-Way Communication Systems

708.1 General. Two-way communication systems shall comply with 708.

Advisory 708.1 General. Devices that do not require handsets are easier to use by people who have a limited reach.

708.2 Audible and Visual Indicators. The system shall provide both audible and visual signals.

Advisory 708.2 Audible and Visual Indicators. A light can be used to indicate visually that assistance is on the way. Signs indicating the meaning of visual signals should be provided.

708.3 Handsets. Handset cords, if provided, shall be 29 inches (735 mm) long minimum.

708.4 Residential Dwelling Unit Communication Systems. Communications systems between a residential dwelling unit and a site, building, or floor entrance shall comply with 708.4.

708.4.1 Common Use or Public Use System Interface. The common use or public use system interface shall include the capability of supporting voice and TTY communication with the residential dwelling unit interface.

708.4.2 Residential Dwelling Unit Interface. The residential dwelling unit system interface shall include a telephone jack capable of supporting voice and TTY communication with the common use or public use system interface

From Akuvox website

The Akuvox E16 is a feature-packed video door phone with facial recognition, access control, temperature, mask detection and more

This 5 inch facial recognition door phone designed for commercial and residential applications. Featuring touchless building access, wireless communication, 1 output relay, Wiegand, RS485, TF card slot, a camera, built-in reader, and a 20,000 face and card capacity on its 7-inch touch screen display, it ensures excellent intercom communication and versatile access control.

Specifications

- **5" Touch Screen**
- **Dual Cameras**
- **Facial Recognition**
- **NFC**

- **RFID**
- **Bluetooth**
- **Expandable for Temperature Detection**
- **IP65**

WiFi addresses at this property

Hi-Point-General
Hi-Point-Guest
Hi-Point-Residents

Attach
Picture front door Akuvox - no signage
Picture of parking stalls 13-16 dated

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

Re: What is the correct rent? Inquiry seven.

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: lahd.rso.central@lacity.org

Cc: cityatty.help@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org; councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.park@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org; cd10@lacity.org; councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org; councilmember.jurado@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org; councilmember.padilla@lacity.org

Date: Friday, May 1, 2026 at 09:21 PM PDT

Quote from the RSLRSO bulletin says "effective February 2, 2026 the RSO annual rent increase must not include any additional percentage increase for utilities."

I have customarily been paying the 2% increase for gas and electric because in my rent agreement is included in the rent and I do not pay for those charges outside of the rent payment.

I received a rent increased notice for December effective February 1, 2026. Does this mean that I am paying the incorrect rent. The owner has not responded.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

On Friday, May 1, 2026 at 08:56:53 PM PDT, G Johnson <tainmount@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

"Any annual rent increase not previously noticed and served during the period beginning June 1st 2025 through June 30th of 2026 shall comply with this subsection. Any such rent increase shall not exceed three percent and shall not include any additional increase based on the landlords payment of utilities."

My rent currently includes the 2% the landlord gets for payment of the utilities; I do not pay for the utilities gas and electric separately. I have asked the landlord to correct the rent paid. Our rent went up February 1, 2026.

The landlord has not responded to my inquiry which was made in February 2026.

Can anyone in your department answer this? Since I have filed past RSO complaints, I am sure you have copies of my rent checks since 2014.

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

What is the correct rent?

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: lahd.rso.central@lacity.org

Cc: cityatty.help@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org; councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.park@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org; cd10@lacity.org; councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org; councilmember.jurado@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org; councilmember.padilla@lacity.org

Date: Friday, May 1, 2026 at 08:56 PM PDT

"Any annual rent increase not previously noticed and served during the period beginning June 1st 2025 through June 30th of 2026 shall comply with this subsection. Any such rent increase shall not exceed three percent and shall not include any additional increase based on the landlords payment of utilities."

My rent currently includes the 2% the landlord gets for payment of the utilities; I do not pay for the utilities gas and electric separately. I have asked the landlord to correct the rent paid. Our rent went up February 1, 2026.

The landlord has not responded to my inquiry which was made in February 2026.

Can anyone in your department answer this? Since I have filed past RSO complaints, I am sure you have copies of my rent checks since 2014.

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



Google Maps

2,000,000

photo views



Los Angeles Housin...

10/29/17



[See your photos >](#)

Your photo is helping in a big way

Congrats! Your post just reached a new milestone. It's now been viewed over 2,000,000 times, helping lots of people get the information they need.

[Contribute more](#)



Los Angeles Housing Department
Rent Stabilization Division – Investigation & Enforcement

1910 Sunset Blvd, Suite 300, Los Angeles, CA 90026
Tel.: 213-275-3493 | Toll-free: 866-557-7368
housing.lacity.gov

TENANT COMPLAINT FORM

Your complaint has been received. Investigative staff will contact you within 3 business days. Please ensure documentation is provided to support your complaint. Documents can be mailed, faxed, or emailed to the Assigned Office as listed below. Please ensure that your Case Number is indicated on the documents submitted.

There is no charge for filing this complaint. If an investigation reveals a violation of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, you will be contacted before your landlord is notified of the violation. The filing of this complaint does not prevent the landlord from initiating a legal action against you in court.

If you receive any court documents, it is your responsibility to seek legal assistance.

Date of Complaint:	05/04/2026
LAHD Case Number:	
Alleged Violation(s):	Illegal Rent Increase, Reduction of Services, Harassment
Assigned Office:	1910 Sunset Blvd, Suite 300, Los Angeles, CA 90026 Fax: 213-314-6279 Toll-Free: 866-557-7368 Email: lahd.rso.central@lacity.org

I. Property Detail

APN: 5068018035

Address: 1522 S HI POINT ST, #9, Los Angeles, CA 90035

Unit No.: 9

II. Tenant Information

Full Name	Address	Unit No.	Home Phone	Work Phone	Cell Phone	Fax	Email
Geary Juan Johnson	1522 S HI POINT ST, Los Angeles, CA 90035	9	(323) 807-3099				tainmount@sbcglobal.net

III. Landlord Information

Owner Type	Full Name	Address	Home Phone	Work Phone	Cell Phone	Fax	Email
Owner	Benjamin Renkainen	8885 Venice Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90034		(310) 593-3955			benjamin@powerpropertygrp.com

IV. Unit Detail

Rental Unit Type: Apartment	
Total Bedroom: 1	Move In Date: 02/16/2010
Current Rent: \$1,813.00	Foreclosure Activity: No
Section 8: No	Do you still live in this rental unit?: Yes

Number of people living in rental unit 18 years old or over: 2
Number of people living in rental unit under the age of 18 years old: 0
<p>Do you wish to provide more details regarding the Allegations : REDUCTION OF SERVICES. This rent agreement provides for repairs upon the tenants' demand upon the owner. . There is no indication in the rent agreement that I have to pay the landlord for repairs. The owner claims in a letter dated March 13, 2026, that I have to pay for the parts and installation of an accessible unit door peephole. There is no such provision in the rental agreement. Further, the owner replaced the peephole in or around 2025 December and there was no charge or fee. At that time of that repair, I had asked for a peephole to see both ends of the hallway, and the owner did not do so, but also did not say there would be a fee. The 3/13 owner letter is attached, and my fax of March 24, 2026 response. ILLEGAL RENT INCREASE. The owner's letter of March 13, 2026, is an illegal rent increase. ILLEGAL RENT INCREASE. The ordinance city 188795 provides "An annual rent increase not previously noticed and served during the period beginning June 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026, shall comply with this subsection. Any such rent increase shall not exceed three percent and shall not include any additional increase based on the landlord's payment of utilities." My rental agreement provides for utilities paid through the rent; there are no separate fees. I attach the rental increase notices for 2020, 2023, 2024, and 2025. You already have numerous copies of my rental agreement. The owner still charged me the 2% for utilities for the Feb 2026 rent increase. I have told this to the owner, and he has not responded. HARASSMENT. All of these actions by the landlord are harassment because they serve no legitimate purpose and substantially disturb my full and peaceful enjoyment of the premises.</p>
What do you consider a fair resolution to your complaint?: Per the allegations above.

V. Reason(s) For Complaint

Illegal Rent Increase
Reduction of Services

City case no. CE 323473

Recall Code enforcement Inspection- attach to code violation complaint.
987103

3279 words

9:35 am.

Monday, April 27, 2026

Debris behind dumpster glass door.

Debris plastic tarp in stall #12

No posted in common area “right to counsel.”

I told city employee Alfredo that previous city employee Christenson had taken pictures of the peephole in my door, mailbox slot which could be easily with little cost changed to accessible level peephole.

Inspector Alfredo came into unit and saw nonworking Artolier intercom and also saw my wheelchair near the unit door.

I told Alfredo that the previous owner had replaced the Artolier system in 2014 but did not replace mine. There was a new box on the outside of the building and interface wired connections to each of the 15 other units. I told Alfredo that in 2023 the new owner installed the AKUVOX on the outside of the building but no connection was made by interface or otherwise to the inside of each unit. I also showed Alfredo the outside box for a AKUVOX door entry intercom and showed him some of the functions that do not work and showed him that it does appear to be a camera, but I said I've been told by the city discrimination department that there is no audio and no cameras connecting the outside units to each apartment. I quoted building code section at 11 B – 708 accessibility requirements.

The Akuvox system installed is “R29

World's First Facial Recognition Android Doorphone

Akuvox R29 is a SIP video doorphone with a 7” touch screen, which performs AI-powered offline facial recognition for door access. It is typically used in apartment buildings, high-rise office buildings and building complexes.” According to the manufacturer, the device contains two

cameras, and “Yes, the Akuvox R29 is a high-end SIP-based smart IP video intercom that features advanced two-way audio and video communication, facial recognition, and mobile app integration. It allows residents to see and speak with visitors, as well as remotely unlock doors via smartphone, indoor monitors, or IP phones.” (Ad). So so says the manufacturer, this is an intercom two way communication device. The ad does not say the intercom/camera function can be turned off.

I indicated that the accessible peep hole, accessible parking stall, and accessible two-way communication Intercom system are requirements of the city building code. Alfredo said that he was not sure, but he would have to check on all of those areas and get back to me.

This indicated to me that there has been numerous code enforcement complaints filed with the portal as well as copies sent to specific and individual code enforcement employees as well as City Counsel employees and that Alfredo appeared to have no awareness of those complaints nor had he read those complaints. I feel this is abuse of federal tax dollars being that the employee should be aware of the complaint or complaints before they come out to the property although he did say he was doing a follow up.

I showed Alfredo the debris glass door behind the garbage can, and I also showed him what looked like some plastic sheets rolled behind parking stall number 16. Alfredo said he was more concerned if there's a large communication or accumulation of debris rather than one or two items.

I indicated to Alfredo that I have requested a dedicated handicap parking install that would be near the back door. Currently, I am assigned to a shared parking store number eight.

Alfredo said he believed that the ADA is subject to grandfather clause. My response that there is no grandfather clause look back on the ADA requirements. I have previously said to the city code enforcement, inspectors that there is guest stalls on this parking lot, proven by a written statement from the previous resident Manager. I believe that guest stalls are under the jurisdiction of the ADA and that therefore the parking stalls are under the jurisdiction of the city code enforcement..

I also indicated to Alfredo that besides being local accessibility building code requirements, the repair items that I am speaking of are repair maintenance items and maintenance that is covered under the Health & Safety Code and the jurisdiction of the code enforcement inspectors. There is striping of a parking stall to make it into a handicap. Parking stall is under the jurisdiction of the code enforcement department; the replacement of the unit door people with an accessible wheelchair height peephole is a maintenance issue under the jurisdiction of the code enforcement department; the maintenance of the Intercom system in order to make it contain a camera and audio is a maintenance issue under the jurisdiction of the code enforcement department. Since these are all maintenance issues, then they are covered by the rental agreement and rent paid, then the owner cannot charge a fee to provide these housing services or accommodations. There is no posting on the property that there is a fee to provide a parking single or tandem. There is no fee posted to the property or there is no sign posted to the property that there is a fee to install a accessible door peephole and in fact in December, the owner installed another peephole in my door and there was no charge. I think the code enforcement does have jurisdiction over the fact that if the owner tries to charge us a fee for a reasonable accommodation, housing service, then that would be the jurisdiction of the housing department as an illegal rent increase.

I mentioned the safety factor of having an abandoned water heater on the property. He examined it and it is clearly not connected but is strapped to the wall. Alfredo said as long as it is not hurting anyone, even though it is trash, the city would not require the owner to move it. It seems like a potential for harm since it is not operated and children may be in that area since it is the laundry room. It is the type of debris that could cause harm. Alfredo said he did not consider the debris I pointed out as “excessive.” I disagreed.

I told him that I believe code enforcement does enforce the ADA regulations. I mentioned that the building is not wheelchair accessible that I cannot come up the front steps with the wheelchair. I said I would use the wheelchair at the back door since it is more accessible (only one step to

navigate) but that I need a handicapped assessable parking stall, not the shared one a I currently occupy stall #8.

Alfredo said code enforcement goes by the year of the building and that the ADA does not allow them to go back retroactive; I told him I do not think the ADA has a retroactive prohibition.

As I have stated to city employees, the ADA has authority over parking if there are quest parking stalls. Since there have been quest stalls since 1972, the ADA would apply.

I did explain to Alfredo that the property was modified in year 2014 with the addition of an electronic parking gate, thus the gate and modification of parking lot is under the jurisdiction of the ADA.

I also believe that parking stall 1A is numbered as such to indicate “guest” stall which puts the property under ADA requirements.

The numbers on the parking stalls are faded, as faded paint is an accessibility violation. Faded paint is an architectural barrier that the code enforcement has jurisdiction over.

NO RIGHT TO counsel notice in common area, as told to Alfredo.

ADA units vs ADA building says Alfredo.

- **Existing Buildings (Readily Achievable):** For older, existing buildings, removing barriers (such as replacing an inaccessible intercom) is required if it is "readily achievable"—meaning it can be done without much difficulty or expense.

RESEARCH (mostly AI from Google)

In the City of Los Angeles, the primary agency enforcing reasonable housing accommodations for people with disabilities in city-mandated housing is the **Los Angeles Housing Department**

(LAHD) through its Accessible Housing Program (AcHP). LAHD handles reasonable accommodation and modification requests, ensuring fair access to housing.

Key agencies involved include:

- **LAHD (Los Angeles Housing Department):** Enforces, reviews, and processes reasonable accommodation requests.
- **HACLA (Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles):** Manages reasonable accommodations for public housing and Section 8 voucher holders.
- **California Civil Rights Department (CRD):** Enforces state fair housing laws regarding accommodations.

For violations, residents can file complaints with LAHD or the Fair Housing Rights Center. (Source AI).

Key Guest Parking Regulations in Los Angeles

- **Multifamily Requirements:** For developments with 11 or more units, the city generally requires a minimum of 1 guest parking space for every 10 dwelling units.
- **Signage:** Guest parking spaces must be clearly posted with signs at building entrances, indicating the location and number of reserved spaces.
- **Security Gates:** If guest parking is located behind a security gate, the code requires an electronic intercommunication system to be accessible for visitors to call individual units.
- **Location:** Guest spaces should be distributed throughout the development.
- **Dimensions:** Standard parking stalls in [LA City](#) are typically 8.5'x18' for standard, 7.5'x15' for compact, while accessible spaces must be 108 inches (9 ft) wide with a 5 ft access aisle, or 144 inches (12 ft) for vans.

Key details regarding ADA guest parking requirements include:

- **1-25 total spaces:** 1 must be accessible.

- **26-50 total spaces:** 2 must be accessible.
- **51-75 total spaces:** 3 must be accessible.
- **Van Accessibility:** At least 1 of every 6 accessible spaces must be van-accessible.
- **Location:** Accessible spaces must be on the shortest accessible route to the accessible entrance.
- **Residential Parking:** For residential, parking must be accessible if it is for first occupancy on or after **March 13, 1991**.

Does the ADA apply retroactively to older buildings? The building was built in 1973 but the owner modified the property in 2014 with security parking gate. The 2010 ADA parking requirements would apply.

Yes, the [2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design](#) apply to parking lot modifications (such as restriping or resurfacing) performed in 2014. Because the work occurred after March 15, 2012, the altered areas must comply with the 2010 regulations, specifically regarding the number, size, and location of accessible spaces.


Key ADA Compliance Rules for 2014 Modifications:

- **Trigger for Compliance:** Any alterations—including restriping, resealing, or resurfacing—made after March 15, 2012, trigger the requirement to comply with the 2010 Standards.
- **Safe Harbor Clause:** If the parking lot complied with the 1991 ADA Standards and was not altered between 1992 and March 15, 2012, it was "grandfathered." However, making modifications in 2014 voids this safe harbor for the altered elements, requiring them to meet the 2010 standards.
- **Extent of Compliance:** If only specific spots are restriped, only those spots need to comply. If the entire lot is modified, the entire lot must comply to the maximum extent feasible.

- **Requirements:** Accessible parking must be on the shortest accessible route to the entrance, with appropriate signage and van-accessible spaces

Yes, the installation of an electric parking gate is generally considered an **alteration to the property**. It is frequently classified as a structural modification, improvement, or addition rather than normal maintenance, because it involves permanent changes to the property's infrastructure, such as adding new structures, electrical systems, and changing the site's layout. Here is a breakdown of why it is classified as an alteration:

Why It's Considered an Alteration

- **Structural Change:** Installing a gate—especially one with a concrete foundation for a sliding track or a concrete pad for a swing motor—alters the existing landscape and pavement.
- **Electrical System Modification:** Installing an electric gate requires running new electrical lines from the building's power supply to the gate, which is considered a significant alteration.
- **Safety & Access Regulations:** An electric gate must comply with local, state, and national safety codes (e.g., [ICC standards](#) ), ensuring that the new, automated structure does not create entrapment risks.
- **Impact on Usability:** An automatic gate changes how people enter, exit, or use the parking area.

If the property has not been altered since 1972, the primary federal requirement is compliance with the FHA for common areas (common area parking, leasing offices), rather than the full ADA parking technical standards. [1, 2] Source: AI. The property was altered in 2014 (full electrical, plumbing, intercom, and parking gate installed) and 2023, so the ADA does apply.

233.3.1.2 Residential Dwelling Units with Communication Features

In facilities with residential dwelling units, at least 2 percent, but no fewer than one unit, of the total number of residential dwelling units shall provide communication features complying with [809.5](#).

Certificate of Occupancy for this property was issued 4/17/1973.

MODIFICATION OF THE PROPERTY IN 2014 INCLUDING PARKING GATE, INTERCOM SYSTEM, AND DOOR PEEPHOLES. AT THE TIME, THERE WAS NO ADDITIONAL SEPARATE FEE OR CHARGE TO TENANTS.

New door peepholes were installed at this address in 2014 for all units except units 8,9,5. Those peepholes allowed tenants to see both ends of the hallway. This was a modification of the property,

Yes, changing a door peephole is generally considered a **modification or alteration** in a rental or condominium setting. While it is often classified as a minor alteration, it involves a physical change to the structure of the door, which is property owned by the landlord or the association. [[1](#), [2](#), [3](#)] **No-Drill Products:** Use wireless peephole cameras that mount over the existing, original peephole using adhesives.

Building accessibility triggers are events, such as renovations, alterations, or changes in use, that mandate compliance with standards like the [Americans with Disabilities Act \(ADA\)](#). Alterations to a "primary function area"—such as renovating a lobby, office, or dining area—trigger the requirement to provide an accessible path of travel. This path, including restrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains, must be upgraded if the cost is not "disproportionate" (typically up to 20% of the overall project cost).

Key triggers and requirements include:

- **Alterations to Primary Function Areas:** Any remodeling that affects the usability of a major functional space triggers path-of-travel accessibility requirements.
- **Path of Travel Cost Constraint:** If the alterations trigger is met, 20% of the construction cost must be spent on barrier removal on the path of travel (e.g., parking, walkways, restrooms).

- **Renovation Scale:** In some cases, if the cost of a renovation exceeds a certain percentage (often 30%) of the total property value, full building compliance may be triggered.
- **New Construction/Additions:** Newly constructed facilities or additions to existing buildings must meet full accessibility standards.
- **Barrier Removal:** Under ADA Titles II and III, entities must remove architectural barriers in existing buildings, even without renovations, if it is "readily achievable".

Examples of Triggers and Improvements:

- **Trigger:** Renovating a restroom \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Installing grab bars and widening doors.
- **Trigger:** Repaving a parking lot \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Creating accessible parking spaces.
- **Trigger:** Upgrading lighting \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Installing flashing fire alarm lights.
- **Trigger:** Rearranging retail layout \(\rightarrow\) **Improvement:** Creating wider aisles.

Yes, the lack of a unit peephole (or equivalent door viewer) is often considered a violation of building codes or safety standards in many jurisdictions, particularly for multi-family dwellings.

Here is a breakdown of the requirements:

- **Legal Requirements:** In many cities, including New York City, it is mandatory to provide and maintain a peephole in the entrance door of each dwelling unit.
- **Building Codes:** Many jurisdictions follow codes requiring a means of identifying visitors without opening the door, often interpreted as a peephole with a 180-degree view.
- **Accessibility Standards:** ADA guidelines often require peepholes to be installed at specific, accessible heights (e.g., 43 to 60 inches) to accommodate all residents.

- **Exceptions:** These rules often apply to multi-family, R-2, or apartment-style buildings. In some cases, a vision panel or sidelight next to the door can satisfy the requirement.
- **Repercussions:** If a door lacks a required viewer, it is usually considered a maintenance issue that the landlord must fix.

Yes, a lack of accessible parking stalls is considered an architectural barrier under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other accessibility standards. Physical features, including parking, that limit or prevent people with disabilities from accessing goods or services constitute a barrier that often requires removal.

Key aspects regarding parking as an architectural barrier include:

- **Essential Components:** Lack of required designated spaces, absence of van-accessible spaces, or failure to provide a proper, stable, and level access aisle.
- **Location Constraints:** Accessible spaces must be on the shortest, most level, and safe accessible route to the entrance.
- **Maintenance:** Faded paint, missing signage, or deterioration that renders a space unusable is also considered a barrier violation.
- **Legal Obligation:** Businesses are required to remove such barriers if it is "readily achievable" (easily accomplishable without much difficulty or expense). [[1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)]

The City of Los Angeles has the duty to assure that in this city funding assisted building, that the owner must remove all architectural barriers to providing me reasonable accommodations as requested.

Yes, the lack of an accessible, two-way tenant communication system (intercom) is considered an **architectural barrier** under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Fair Housing Act (FHA) if it prevents people

with disabilities from accessing the building or using common areas. [[1](#), [2](#), [3](#)]

If a building is required to be accessible (due to new construction, renovation, or being a public accommodation), the intercom system must allow for independent use by individuals with hearing, speech, or mobility impairments. [[1](#), [2](#)]

Key Accessibility Requirements for Intercoms

To avoid being classified as an architectural barrier, intercom systems must meet the following standards:

- **Mounting Height (Mobility Access):** Intercoms must be mounted at a reachable height for wheelchair users, generally with the highest operable part no more than **48 inches** above the floor.
- **Two-Way Communication (Hearing/Speech Access):** The system must offer more than just audio. It should include **visual signals** (e.g., LED lights indicating the door is unlocked) to ensure communication for the deaf or hard of hearing.
- **Operational Ease:** Controls should not require tight grasping or twisting to operate.
- **Clear Floor Space:** There must be a clear floor space of at least $\backslash(30 \backslash \times 48 \backslash)$ inches in front of the intercom to allow for a wheelchair approach. [[1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)]

When is it a Legal Violation?

- **New Construction & Major Alterations:** Under the ADA and FHA, new multifamily housing (built after March 13, 1991, with 4+ units) must have accessible, operable, and usable communication features.
- **Existing Buildings (Readily Achievable):** For older, existing buildings, removing barriers (such as replacing an inaccessible intercom) is required if it is "readily achievable"—meaning it can be done without much difficulty or expense.
- **Public Housing:** Public housing providers receiving federal funding (HUD/Section 504) must provide accessible, effective communication,

including flashing lights or visual notification systems for residents who are deaf. [[1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)]

What Constitutes an Inaccessible System?

An intercom system is likely an architectural barrier if it:

- Is mounted too high to be reached from a wheelchair.
- Requires a handset that cannot be used by someone with a hearing impairment (lacks a TTY or text-based option).
- Uses only voice to signal that help is on the way during an emergency.

If you are a tenant facing this issue, you may have the right to request a "reasonable accommodation" or "reasonable modification" to the building's intercom system.

Older buildings (pre-1990) are not exempt from the ADA and must remove barriers if it is "readily achievable" (easily accomplishable without much difficulty or expense). While full retrofitting isn't always required, owners must ensure accessible parking, entrance, and paths of travel if possible. If the building is altered, those areas must comply with current ADA standards.

Geary J. Johnson

1522 Hi Point St 90035

April 27, 2026. Word count 3279.

April 15, 2026. Housing services and requested reasonable accommodations still not supplied

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: alan.christensen@lacity.org; vasquezbrian79@gmail.com; marke.bridge@lacity.org; vatche.kasumyan@lacity.org; germain.mendoza@lacity.org; oigcompl@lapd.online; steven.harrison@lacity.org; councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org; bob.blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; cd10@lacity.org; councilmember.park@lacity.org; councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.jurado@lacity.org; councilmember.mcosker@lacity.org; lahd.rso.central@lacity.org; lahd.reap@lacity.org; controller.mejia@lacity.org; dod.contact@lacity.org; aoa.crsa@aoausa.com; aram.avedisian@lacity.org; eric.bane@lacity.org; doran.bobadilla@lacity.org; laura.zimmerman@lacity.org; grant.woods@lacity.org; sewada.zadoorian@lacity.org; jason.wilson@lacity.org; kelly.warner@lacity.org; mark.wang@lacity.org; gavin@gavinnewsom.com; fabian.gonzalez@lacity.org; ramazanali.almasi@lacity.org; kevin.brown@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; rene.flores@lacity.org; 09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us; thomas@powerpropertygrp.com; brent@powerpropertygrp.com; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com; phillip.munguia@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026 at 08:01 PM PDT

Who is Responsible for the Cost? Generally, in affordable housing financed or assisted by a program administered by the City or CRA/LA, including bond-financing, the housing provider is responsible for the costs associated with a reasonable accommodation or modification. Source: Los Angeles City Clerk

<https://housing.lacity.gov/housing/reasonable-accommodations-and-modifications>

<https://share.google/DNYpwwMdlTgUeFJ5s>

Summary

1. This complaint concerns a request to property owner for reasonable accommodation handicap parking stall, pending since around December 2025.
2. This complaint concerns a request to the property owner for reasonable accommodation, wheelchair accessible unit peephole along with peephole that can see to both ends of the hallway, pending since around December 2025. Tenants in about 15 other units were given peep hole in 2014 that can see both ends of the hallway. I did not receive the same such peephole in 2014.
3. This complaint concerns request to the property owner, reasonable accommodation interface or indoor monitor to be installed in the unit. This has been pending since 2014 and 2023 when the owner installed the latest Wi-Fi based Intercom system but admits there is no accompanying interface or video or audio capability in the unit. Tenants in fifteen other units around 2014-2018 were given indoor connections to the intercom system, and denied to me as city code enforcement complaints show.
4. I reference city building code section 11A-708 and any other codes applicable at the the time the building was built, and at the time the parking gate was installed and the 2023 door entry system was installed.
5. A picture is attached showing vacant stalls tandem numbered 13, 14, 15.
6. Reference code violation complaint 983423.
7. The city code enforcement employees have the authority to verify the parking assignments at this property.

ADA applies to the parking lot

The ADA applies when some of the parking on site are for the public or for guests. A previous resident manager indicated in writing that there are parking stalls for guests on this site. In addition since there are 18 units and parking for a 27 cars, then the conduct of the owners that some of these stalls are to be used for guests. The ADA applies and there must be a handicap parking stall designated. In addition, some tenants who do not have a car or under the belief that their parking stall can be used for their guests. If that is the case, then the ADA applies. Since the property owner frequently lies, refuses to reassign me to one of these three vacant tandem stalls, then this indicates that those stalls are to be for purposes of guests.

City Inspector Alan Christensen,

(alan.christensen@lacity.org). Date: March 17, 2026. (Via email to council members also).

Thank you for inspecting on March 16, 2026 at about 10:00 am for the property 1522 Hi Point Street.

I memorialize the visit. This recount is meant to be indicative but not all inclusive. I showed you the nonfunctional intercom in my unit Artolier, I showed you that there is no connection or interface in my unit for the outside accessible required feature Akuvox system (since 2023), I showed you the unused mailbox slot in the unit door, I mentioned that I do not have a key to the building front door lock as the owner changed the lock, I showed you the need for a wheelchair accessible peephole (my wheelchair was in sight) in my unit door, I asked that the owner be ordered to supply a peephole that I can see both ends of the hallway (due to disability and vision disability), I showed you trash that is on the property but is not in the dumpster, I showed you the parking security gate in a non-operating position, I mentioned my need for a tandem or accessible parking stall, on the grounds my doctors have certified my disability and requested such parking stall or accommodation.

Further, I am following up to request written confirmation of your findings and next steps: you witnessed the building's Akuvox exterior entry panel has no indoor interface/monitor provided to tenants, we tested the system together and found there is no intercom functionality for many units and especially mine, there is no accessible peephole/alternative to identify visitors at my unit door, and the property owner (parking 27 stalls: single stalls 1A,1B,2-12; tandem 13-19; vacant/unused 1A,4,6,10,13-15; stalls 17-18 each have one car) has not assigned me an accessible parking stall near the rear accessible entry; the building received major renovations and new parking security gate in 2014-2017 and a new Akuvox door entry system in 2023 and the owner receives Section 8 assistance.

In response, the investigator Alan did take pictures and notes. He indicated that it was his personal opinion that I could use my personal property cell phone to access the Akuvox intercom function; I indicated that the building code does not authorize me to use my personal property for any reason, and that applicable building codes specifically require the Wifi type Akuvox have in each apartment unit an interface or indoor monitor capable of displaying voice and video. My cell phone is not for such use, is not an interface or indoor monitor owned by the property owner or owned by the city government. There is no mention in the applicable building codes that a tenant cell phone can satisfy the building code requirements.

It is a violation of my personal property to attempt to illegally steal my phone for purpose of the property owner and for purposes of violation of the city building code.

I also believe from the city website the city code enforcement inspectors have authority to investigate certain ADA violations at the property.

I believe it is an abuse of authority and abuse of discretion and abuse of federal tax dollars if ADA violations are not investigated by City code enforcement inspectors in a timely manner. Please advise in writing whether the Housing Department will (a) open a code compliance investigation regarding the lack of an indoor monitor and accessibility issues, (b) issue correction notices to the owner, or (c) refer this matter to another city office (Housing, ADA coordinator, or other).

If enforcement is limited, please provide the appropriate contact or case number so I can follow up. I appreciate a written response.

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

(Tenant since 2010)
Alan Christensen worked as a Housing Inspector for the city of Los Angeles, California and in 2020 had a reported pay of \$96,507.36-\$107,573.76 according to public records. (Source: Google AI).

Note: Brian Vasquez is the resident manager at this location.

The email above appears on Citywatch and also Facebook.



2026-4-3 Parking Lot Tandem Stalls.jpg.pdf
2.4 MB

A state and city building code require that the property owner Hi Point 1522 LLC install an indoor monitor in each unit. He has refused to do so. For him to try to make the tenants pay for the use of the intercom system is an action of fraud.

Via facsimile, us mail, and email
To Hi Point 1522 LLC

Mr. Thomas Khammar, agent for Hi Point 1522 LLC:

I have received your letter dated February 11, 2026 as it was posted to my apartment door. I'm glad you took advantage of a different way to deliver communication to me since you do not seem to have any expertise with the email or fax systems. Your letter is not acceptable as a resolution to the issues at hand, nor is it acceptable to the damages that have occurred. Since this is a city rent control building and since this building and owner receive government assistance, I feel it is prudent to send my response to those government agencies also.

You mentioned the letter from [REDACTED] and you claim it was sent to you for the first time on February 5, 2026. You claim "the letter is submitted in support of your request for a reasonable accommodation regarding the Intercom system in the building where you reside located at 1522 Hi Point St., and your parking space at the subject building. We further acknowledge receipt of materials for the same subject request sent concurrently with Dr. Tripp letter. As you know, we responded to the primary materials as part of the most recent lawsuit you bought concerning those same issues, which was instigated at or about the same time the prior material first submitted." Disability or reasonable accommodation was not a cause of action for the August filed lawsuit. You did not respond to my request for a handicapped parking stall. The four page letter faxed to you, in major part is not responded to by you. You claim your December court filing addresses these issues but you did not receive the four page letter until February 5 by fax so therefore much of the issues were not addressed in your court filing. **The February 5 fax therefore is new evidence not before the Court.**

My previous requests were entitled to confidentiality; you are in violation of my privacy rights by filing your response with the court if it indeed addresses my medical ailments.

Let me try to clear up your confusion here because it misrepresents the facts.

1. I agree that the [REDACTED] pp letter was sent to you Feb 5 even though dated prior. I did not have it in my possession in December 2025 as my ailments are still developing. Nevertheless, the last hearing in this matter was on January 6, 2026, therefore the letter that you received on February 5, 2026 represents new evidence that could not be presented at the January 6 hearing or before. As you know, the time for presenting evidence had already expired before January 6. You are admitting that your fax system works because these documents were sent to you by fax. You failed to mention the specificity of the disabled auto placard in the doctor diagnosis, also the wheelchair receipt and order. The August 11, 2025 letter from [REDACTED] was never responded by you in a timely manner. My letter of February 5 via fax and support is essentially ignored by you. The April 12, 2023 letter from [REDACTED] was not responded by you in a timely matter. That letter could not be included in the 2022 lawsuit because it represented new evidence.
2. The disability complaints were not the subject of my complaint in the case ending in 3297. Since they were not presented as evidence or in the complaint, they cannot be adjudicated on. You never served your documents on me, and I received them only by going to the court website. The fax indicate that your documents never reach me and they were never served on me properly. I don't really have responsibility to acknowledge them. Nevertheless, you chose to make that response a public document when such matters are entitled to confidentiality so you have violated my rights in regard. I acknowledge your filing with the court improper as much as it was because there's no allowance in small claims

court for such type documents or rebuttal, but I will acknowledge it at a future time. Just on the surface from your today letter, February 11, whatever you have to say in that letter court filed declaration is not acceptable as a resolution.

3. I know it may not be clear to you, but you cannot send documents to me under somebody else's name without me, knowing that you're going to use that person's name and address to send documents to me because otherwise those documents will be disregarded as junk or spam mail. Since I did not know that you were sending me documents by some type of document service, I did not receive any mail and the mail was discarded or refused because I did not know who it was from and I did contact you at the time asking was the certified mail coming from you from unknown address, but you did not respond to me. Nevertheless, your documents were never served on me and whatever service you were using that claims that they were sent by certified now has been verified from the Postal Service that those document were returned to your agent, therefore they never reached me. That it would be untruthful to say that you serve me with the documents which she did not. There's also no indication by you that you serve them by first class mail because you served them by certified mail so I didn't get the certified mail nor did I get the first class mail. You are not being truthful in your narrative. The USPS verified the certified mail was returned to you unopened. The USPS verified there were no documents from you or your agent served by first class mail. Your purpose was to engage in unlawful deception.

I address your second paragraph. You claim res judicata and collateral estoppel. You are incorrect. As addressed to the court by my documentation exhibits, res judicata does not apply when the defendant are not the same and it does not apply if the facts are not the same. Collateral estoppel is in the same category and that it does not apply because you have admitted that some of the documentation you were talking about occurred after the court jurisdiction had stopped in other words the letter from Dr. [REDACTED] received after the court had already had its last hearing on the matter, therefore could not be presented. The [REDACTED] letter is new evidence.

You claim, "we responded to the prior materials as part of the most recent lawsuit, you bought concerning the same issues which was indicated at her about the same time the prior materials were first submitted." That is non sensical. The lawsuit was filed around August 2025. The letter from Dr. [REDACTED] 4/12/2023 so that date is no where near August 2025. My first request for reasonable accommodation occurred 11/2/2022 email to you and resulted in CRD case 202211-18872714. The CRD said they spoke with you. There was no response to that RA request. Before August 2025, how many emails and faxes did you receive from me as regards my disability?

The matter of the Intercom and the matter of the tandem parking is still a changing situation, depending on whether you're going to supply the indoor monitor or not, and whether there are tandem stalls available or not tandem stalls available. Tenants come and go and the availability of parking becomes "new evidence" to continue to file code violation complaints. You also are engaged in representing that this matter is about the current parking stall that we have, but it's about how to qualify for a tandem two car parking stall, which you have a number of them available that are not being used. You neither admit nor deny this. I am the best evidence of this because I live there while you do not. As indicated to the court, where there is continuing damages and contractual obligations such as a rental agreement, and in this case a month-to-month rental agreement, and where there is new evidence of violation of the law, res judicata does not apply. You claim "you previously lost two prior lawsuits concerning the same issues and thus the most recent case concern these issues would be barred by res judicata and collateral estoppel." But this is incorrect because at the last hearing, the judge said that she was going to hear the matter because there was new evidence which I had presented, therefore, she rejected your claim therefore, the court rejected your claim of res judicata and collateral.

THREE PREVIOUS CASES and the three victories in my favor

City government employees have also gotten this information wrong because they are biased against myself as a Black tenant with a disability. As I have said before: case 19STSC14394 judgment entered July 2, 2021. Parties are Johnson versus Power Property Management Inc. and Hi Point Apts LLC. In this case, the defendant counter sued me. The court ruled in favor of Hi Point 1522 Apts LLC and said they do not owe me any money. However, the court dismissed defendant Power Property Management without prejudice. This means I'm allowed to sue again Power Property Management and anyone they are privy to which in this case would be Hi Point 1522 LLC, and sue for the same facts. At the same time, Power Property Management counter sued me for money damages, presumably over the intercom and the tandem parking. The court ruled in my favor and said I do not owe them any money. That was a victory for me. **Two victories in my favor.** Thus the court essentially ruled that the current owner being privy to Power Property Management, cannot charge me for the Intercom system and cannot charge me for the tandem parking, as they are trying to do now. So the matter of being able to charge me or not charge me has already been adjudicated in my favor. I know that is something that the city officials do not want to hear, but that is what the record says.

The next case was case ending in 21STSC04574. This case was also against defendant Hi Point Apts LLC, same as case 4394, with a new set of facts. The court issued judgment in my favor. Ordered Feb 16, 2022. **A third victory for me.**

The third case ending in was against a different party, named Hi Point 1522 LLC. Case 21STSC04819. The judge claimed that this was the same party as case number 4394 but that was an incorrect statement because both cases are different parties.

RES JUDICATA IMO DOES NOT APPLY BECAUSE THE PARTIES ARE NOT THE SAME.

The judge did admit that the time frame was different and there was new evidence. The the judge dismissed the case and favored the defendants claiming res judicata to case 4394. that ruling was incorrect and not supported by law because you cannot claim res JUDICATA if the defendants are not the same as in this case. Also, in case 4394, Power Property Management AS defendant and proving to the current property owner was dismissed without prejudice, which was a win for me. If the court is claiming res judicata, then she would have to say and recognize that in case 4394 there was a victory in my favor in that I do not owe Power Property Management any money. So in my opinion, it was unclear what was the relationship between the 4819 case and the 4394 case in that there were two rulings in the 4394 case in my favor. I'm not sure, especially since the parties were different as to what the judge is claiming amounts to res Judicata. There cannot be res judicata if the parties are different and if the facts are different, as in both those cases. Ordered 6/30/22. This is essentially why they allow me to go into court again and again.

Response to Khammar third paragraph

The inspection by the city code enforcement department is biased and discriminatory against me as a black tenant with a disability. In addition, the code enforcement decision by Steven Harrison does not comply with the state and local building codes that require an intercom system and an interface or indoor monitor in each unit. **Subsequently a claim for damages has been filed against the city of Los Angeles. Hi Point 1522 LLC is named in that claim.**

Respond to Khammar fourth paragraph

Khammar claims that the intercom system is functioning. That is not true as proven by the verifiable video evidence that I have presented on a number of occasions to the owner and to

the city government and to the public. Khammar claims “your roommate is registered with and has been regularly using the Intercom from your unit. This evidence was also present to the court and conjunction with your most recent lawsuit and is in your possession.” Mr. Khammar seems to think, and I guess the city government agreed with him, that all Blacks look alike and all Blacks are also act alike and when he talks to one Black, he’s talking to all Blacks, but my roommate and myself are two separate people and two different people, and his actions are not intended to be my actions, and my actions are not intended to be his actions nevertheless, Mr. Khammar’s racial bias is noted in that regard. The Judge, stated very clearly that what you presented to the court was not considered to be evidence, but in your letter you claim, “This evidence was preferred at the most recent small claims trial and is in your possession. Again, the Judge said it was not evidence because it was not filed as evidence. Your filed documents did not comply with the courts motion practice either, and it appears that some of the documents may have been a violation of my confidential privacy rights, which would result in another cause of action against the owner. Mr. Khammar, who seems to be of less than average intelligence, seems not to understand that there are numerous functions on the AKUVOX system, and that since he has little experience in these things, doesn’t understand that the intercom function is separate from the door entry function. But he has alleged that my roommate did was actually use the door entry system which he does probably five days a week. There’s no evidence presented by Mr. Khammar that my roommate has used the intercom system function. It’s very clear if you can see the document. Mr. Khammar, who is a frequent liar, document shows the “action” as “call” (intercom button I guess) the response as none.(—) and then the separate “door release” – “action” pin unlock – response “success”. There’s no indication here that anyone is using the intercom system and that is the statements here by Mr. Khammar that he can just lie, cheat and steal and just get away with it because of Mayor Karen Bass and city council members pattern and practice racial discrimination.

Khammar claims that what [REDACTED] g said “was specifically addressed at the trial for the most recent lawsuit.” I don’t believe that the unofficial transcript claims that what Dr. [REDACTED] was addressed nevertheless that would be a confidential conversation that should’ve not ben filed with the court. Khammar has no grounds to even file anything with the court talking about a disability because I didn’t put that into my complaint. Khammar claims “you are in fact, assigned a parking space at the subject building“. Again, Khammar is engaged in lying, cheating and stealing in deception because the issue at hand is not whether we have a parking spot or not. The issue is how can we get a tandem parking install which is a two car stall which we did have at one time for four years, and Mr. Khammar would be aware of that because he was there some of that time as management company. Nevertheless, an owner cannot discriminate against a tenant by denying them the opportunity to get housing services that are clearly available as in this case. I have presented at least two letters from medical professionals requesting these specific tandem parking stall. I have every right to ask for assignment to a tandem parking stall and I have every right to ask that I’d be moved from a single stall to a two car stall. I have every right to do so and yet you constantly deny me, even though you have the written document from the previous owner that I am entitled to the tandem Parking stall upon paying the \$50 and being first come first serve. That is a condition as the current owner that you are supposed to be following. Nevertheless, I do as a part of my rent payment already paid for the parking and the intercom system to be repaired or whatever the parts are needed. The rental agreement with you does not provide for any cost that you can demand for parking. As such, you are breaching the rent agreement by claiming the \$150.

YOUR PARAGRAPH STARTING WITH NOT WITHSTANDING THE FACT

Mr. Khammar says, without any reference or evidence, “not withstanding the fact the courts on multiple occasions plus the LAHD have rejected that suggestion, we submit your request also amounts to an undue financial administrative burden, and especially when the Intercom works.” The problem here is that it is Mr. Khammar, who has said that the tenants should use

their cell phone and Wi-Fi. I'm not sure what he is talking about when he says the police, but the police have advised against using the cell phone and Wi-Fi and I have the flyer from the police department. So I'm not sure what Khammar is taking about because he's the one that says that tenants should use their own cell phone and Wi-Fi, which is an invasion of tenant privacy. I cannot understand why this would be an undue financial and administrative burden when the previous Intercom system that was there had an indoor monitor of sorts and we didn't have to pay extra \$\$\$ to use it. It was already included in the rent. So it seems if this is a so-called upgrade of the system then it should be on the same basis as the old system that we don't have to pay any extra money that that money for installation repair is already included in the rent. The owner receives about \$1800 from this unit every month and the owner is a millionaire so I don't see why this would be an undue financial administrative burden unless we can see a copy of their financial records. Mr. Khammar is required to install an indoor monitor in each unit by law, and the law does not say that the tenant have to bear the burden of that cost. He installed the Akuvox system on the outside of the building and he did not charge tenants any money nor did they say they would be in charge to tenants to use the system. I do not have in my unit at the indoor monitor that is required by law and Mr. Khammar is claiming he doesn't have the money. What a big big big liar. My rent money includes the Akuvox system and the parts to make it work.

Mr. Khammar states that the owner is agreeable to rent you an extra tandem parking space at the rate of \$150 per month. The city requires the 27 Park stalls at this building so I'm not sure what Mr. Khammar means by extra. What I mean by extra is that there are no extra stalls because this is assigned parking. Every tenant is entitled to a parking stall and at no extra charge. So Mr. Khammar would need to explain where does the \$150 come from being that I was previously told by **the rent agreement that parking is included in the rent** and there's no indication in the rent agreement that stall number eight is a single stall or a tandem stall and there's no indication in the rent agreement that the owner can charge a fee for parking. . I think that Mr. Khammar is without authority to charge \$150. Nevertheless, I do note That when Mr. Khammar appeared before the court, he said he was not sure about the 1\$50 so since he was not sure of the \$150 , then the court did not have jurisdiction and therefore at this point the \$150 if that's what Mr. Khammar is saying, becomes new evidence for a new lawsuit against the Owner Since the \$150 was not adjudicated by the court. Again, Mr. Khammar is lying when he says that providing the space for free presents an undue financial burden. How can it be an undue financial burden when he has 18 tenants in parking for 27 cars. He has extra stalls that are not being used so how is it a financial burden? If he switches me from my current free parking stall, to a free two car stall, how does that represent a Financial burden? He will still have an available parking stall. Which tenants by apartment number are currently paying the \$150 for parking?

I do know that other than rent increases, and court filings this is probably the only communication I've gotten from Mr. Khammar in reference to these matters over probably since 2014. I can note that due to past rulings of the court, which many courts on the state and federal level do not consider small claims actions to have res judicata status, the court has already ruled that the owner of the property cannot charge us any money for the tandem parking or the Intercom system. **I believe it is also local housing law or practice that the owner cannot charge us to use the Intercom system.**

I will be forwarding this response and your letter to the disability department of the city of Los Angeles.

A state and city building code require that the property owner Mr. Khammar install a indoor monitor in each unit. He has refused to do so. For him to try to make the tenants pay for the use of the intercom system is an action of fraud.

Fraud is exception to res judicata

Fraud, Deceit, and Misrepresentation

Fraud in a contract consists of the promisor giving apparent consent against his or her free will.

Furthermore, a “promise made without any intention of performing it constitutes fraud” *Union Flower Mkt. v. S. Cal. Flower Mkt.* (1938) 10 Cal. 2d 671, 676

- “[W]hen defendant has asserted the statute of limitation defense, the plaintiff has the burden of proof to show his or her claims are timely under the continuing violation doctrine.” (Jumaane, supra, 241 Cal.App.4th at p. 1402.)

- “Under the continuing violation doctrine, a plaintiff may recover for unlawful acts occurring outside the limitations period if they continued into that period. The continuing violation doctrine requires proof that (1) the defendant’s actions inside and outside the limitations period are sufficiently similar in kind; (2) those actions occurred with sufficient frequency; and (3) those actions have not acquired a degree of permanence.” (*Wassmann v. South Orange County Community College Dist.* (2018) 24 Cal.App.5th 825, 850-851 [234 Cal.Rptr.3d 712], internal citations omitted.)

Continuing obligations is exception to res judicata.

Further, I shall examine prior lawsuits because you’re not indicating which two prior lawsuits that you are speaking of.

“Yes, your honor. I was told that the cost was \$50 (for tandem parking). That's what I was told repeatedly in writing by the previous owner and my roommate is not, is not using the intercom system.” **Johnson From Jan 6 hearing.**

“I believe, and I can't be quoted on it. So I have to work with the ownership on this \$150 a month. This would be a separate, uh, agreement that he or his roommate would have to sign.” Khammar Jan. 6.

IMO, Legally speaking there is no such thing as a “separate” agreement. The rent agreement says that that is the only agreement.

As for the request for an accommodation, your legal responsibility if you decide to reject the request is to offer a reasonable alternative. Being that you have not offered a different effective accommodation, then you are liable for denying a reasonable accommodation. The matter continues.

My request to you for accommodation includes five documents from medical professionals and my four page request letter.

Since I have a rental agreement, this represents continuing obligations, and for housing services denied, it represents continuing damages. My continuing rent payments are for the parking and repairs and services and rent so my rent payments represent new evidence. The owner claimed that the last court hearing that he did not know if it was \$150 or not for the parking but now in his February 11 letter he is saying that the parking is \$150. That represents new evidence which was not bought before the court by January 6, 2026, therefore that evidence entitles me to file a new lawsuit against the owner.

All rights reserved to revise or modify this response.

/s/ Geary J. Johnson

1522 Hi Point St 9
Los Angeles. CA. 90035