

Communication from Public

Name: Geary Juan Johnson
Date Submitted: 03/21/2026 11:13 AM
Council File No: 26-1200-S14


[illegible]

Table of Contents

Attachments to Agenda Item

Circa March 18, 2026

List Docs to Bender for RSO re Harrassment
2026-3-13 Email RSO Bender Case
2026-3-11 PC Redacted Fax PPM re wheelchair peephole
2025-1-9 Gov agencies for help
2026-3-14 parking 1 of 4 HP.jpg
2026-3-14 parking 2 of 4 HP.jpg
2026-3-14 parking 3 of 4.jpg
2026-3-14 parking 4 of 4 HP.jpg
2026-3-14 Side Windwo Damage Picture.jpg
2026-3-10 Fax to PPM Further Response
2026-3-9 Letter from Thomas Khammar via post
CCP 527.6 Excerpt Terms
2026-3-9 Response to Khammar March 9 letter
2026-2-28 City Civil Rights Filed Receipt
2026-3-5 Email Owner and City re Services and Signage
LAHD ACHP Accessible Housing
2026-2-28 City Disability complaint.pdf
2026-2-27 LAHD Letter Respond in 15 days CE320463
2026-2-26 RSO complaint CE320463.pdf
2026-2-24 Second Johnson Car Window Damaged.jpg
2026-2-11 Letter from Thomas Khammar PPM
2026-1-6 Email Questions to city employee Steven Harrison.pdf
2023-1-17 Verify 2nd stalls 17-19.jpg
2014-6-23 Apt 1522 COO Permit and Notes.pdf
2022-5-15 Revised Email on SC Hearing.pdf
Parking 17-19 at 1522.jpg
2020-10-10 My sign at 1522 and PPM.jpeg
2020-9-9 SC Walter Cross Complaint
2018-2-22 Scanned Random Ad Best Copy.pdf
2018-3-29 USC Trojan Ad Tear Sheet
2017-3-23 Ad SD Daily Reader Final.pdf



Case CE 320 463 Harassment

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: lahd.rso.central@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Friday, March 13, 2026 at 03:08 PM PDT

Attention Adrid Bender, city housing department employee:

1. Tenants at this RSO building have not received the rent reduction for not having a resident manager for six or more months. Is someone handling that or should I file another complaint?
2. The owner vandalized my car by putting permanent adhesive on my car window. He refuses to remove the adhesive and the sign. Will you be reporting this to the police department?
3. I read on the housing website that if the owner was getting 2% for paying for utilities, instead of the tenant paying the utilities, as of February 10 or so the owner can no longer charge the 2%. I have advised the owner of this and they have refused to respond and still charged us the same rate for March 1. Is this something you can address or will I have to follow separate complaint?

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

2026-3-9 List Docs to RSO CE 320 463 sent to Adria Bender, city employee, by email before the deadline of February 13. Bender closed the case on February 13 postmark.

Did she read the documents? Probably not. City sham and shell game.

2026-3-9 Response to Khammar March 9 letter
2026-3-9 Fax PPM Response to His Letter
2026-3-9 Letter from Thomas Khammar via post
2026-3-1 Rent Paid.pdf
2025-10-1 Rent Receipt unit 9.pdf
2026-2-14 Fax PPM re communications.pdf
2026-1-23 Redacted Handicapped Placard Approval Johnson copy
2026-2-24 Second Johnson Car Window Damaged.jpg
2026-2-5 Fax RA to PPM from Johnson.pdf
2025-9-11 SC Redacted Court Approves RA 3297 copy
2026-2-11 PC Letter from Thomas Khammar PPM copy
Redacted Rental agreement 1522 No 9_compressed.pdf
CCP 527.6 Excerpt Terms
2026-3-6 Fax PPM Tandem Parking application requested
Harassment Defined California Code, CCP 527.6.pdf
2025-11-1 Rent Paid PDF
2026-3-7 Fax PPM cars parked illegally.pdf
2026-3-8 Fax to PPM w Placard and Court Order.pdf
2026-3-5 Fax to PPM re Intercom and Parking
2026-3-3 Fax PPM Supplement
2026-2-16 Email to Owner and City
2026-3-3 Letter to HP Owner Via Fax
2026-2-14 Fax PPM re Effective Accommodations
2026-2-28 Fax on Rent Decrease for Utilities.pdf
2026-2-28 Fax PPM with Commentary.pdf
CE 320463 Case RSO Legal Assistance List.pdf
2026-2-27 Fax to PPM re Car Damage and Other Housing
2026-2-26 Fax to Power Property re car Damaged.pdf
2026-2-24 Johnson w 1st Window Damages.jpg
2026-2-18 Fax HP PPM.pdf
2026-2-14 Second fax to Thomas Khammar.pdf
2026-2-14 to send 2nd fax to ppm.pdf

2026-3-9 List Docs to RSO CE 320 463 sent to Adria Bender, city employee, by email before the deadline of February 13. Bender closed the case on February 13 postmark.

2026-2-13 PC Reply to Khammar Feb 11 Letter.pdf

2026-2-1 Rent Receipt Paid.pdf

2026-2-5 Second Fax PPM re RA.pdf

2026-2-5 Disability Complaint RA re PPM Hi Point.pdf

2026-1-1 rent payment unit 9.pdf

2025-12-1 Rent Checks Dec 1.pdf



FAX

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

TO:

Name: Hi Point 1522 LLC c/o Power Property Management

Fax Number: (310) 661-8195

of Pages: 10
(including cover sheet)

FROM:

Name: Geary Juan Johnson

Fax Number: (323) 809-4119

Subject: Wheelchair order supporting need for unit door accessible peephole

Message:

" What is the definition of a wheelchair under the ADA? A wheelchair is a manually operated or power-driven device designed primarily for use by an individual with a mobility disability for the main purpose of indoor, or of both indoor and outdoor, locomotion. Individuals with mobility disabilities must be permitted to use wheelchairs and manually powered mobility aids, i.e., walkers, crutches, canes, braces, or other similar devices designed for use by individuals with mobility disabilities, in any areas open to pedestrian traffic." Attached is a copy of the wheelchair approval which I believe originated from the Neurology department. The Doctor wheelchair order is the justification for the wheelchair accessible unit door peephole. Also, attached is the wheelchair order with the Doctor's name.

FAX

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

TO:

Name: Hi Point 1522 LLC

Fax Number: (310) 661-8195

of Pages: 4
(including cover sheet)

FROM:

Name: Geary Juan Johnson

Fax Number: (323) 809-4119

Subject: Further Response to Your March 9 letter

Message:

See attached

Further Response to Landlord (Rebuttal Letter)

Date: March 10, 2026

Re: Further Response to Accommodation Request – Parking, Intercom Monitor, and Accessible Peephole

Dear Hi Point 1522 LLC:

I am further writing in response to your recent correspondence March 9, 2026 regarding my requests for disability-related accommodations.

As previously explained, I have mobility, balance, and anxiety impairments and utilize a walker and wheelchair. I have also provided documentation from my medical providers supporting the need for accessible parking and intercom accommodations.

Under the Fair Housing Act and California Fair Employment and Housing Act, housing providers must make reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services when necessary for a person with a disability to have equal use and enjoyment of housing.

My request is for reassignment of an existing tandem parking space located closer to the rear entrance of the building. This entrance provides a more accessible path of travel to my ground-floor apartment because the front entrance contains multiple stair landings and steps.

The requested accommodation does not require construction of new parking. Rather, it involves reassignment of existing spaces in a parking area that contains more parking spaces than residential units. As I understand it, the property has approximately 27 parking spaces serving 18 units, and several spaces are currently unused or underutilized.

The owner has claimed he currently has no tandem parking available without explaining what the assignment are: there are 18 units but 19 parking stalls and 18 units but parking for 27 cars. Please provide a list of parking assignments by apartment number so I can determine who is renting the additional two parking stalls, in view of the fact some tenants do

not own drive any car, and in view of the fact you claim no extra available parking at this time.

I am clearly not asking for "free" parking but reassignment of existing parking. Parking by the way is not free because cost of parking is included in the rent paid. So the word "free" is false and intentionally misleading on your part.

Parking has historically been included as part of the rental housing service provided to tenants and has not been subject to a separate fee or agreement. For this reason, the proposal to lease a tandem space for \$150 per month under a separate agreement appears inconsistent with the historical provision of parking services at the property. If you feel you have legal authority to support your position, please provide it.

Because the requested accommodation involves reassignment of existing parking rather than the creation of new parking, it does not impose a financial burden. If the property believes otherwise, please provide documentation supporting the claim that reassignment of an existing parking space would result in an undue financial or administrative burden.

Intercom System Functionality

The building's entry system is a Wi-Fi based audio/visual door entry and intercom that requires an indoor monitor for tenants to receive audio and video communication and to grant access to visitors.

At present, no indoor monitor has been provided in my unit, making the system unusable. Without the monitor, I cannot see or communicate with visitors at the entry door. This issue is particularly significant given my mobility limitations and difficulty quickly reaching the entrance.

Providing the indoor monitor necessary to operate the installed intercom system would restore functionality and allow equal access to the building entry system. Six push buttons on the Akuvox door entry system are: Delivery, Temp Key, Pin, Dial, Contacts, Reception. There is no required signage to indicate how to use the Akuvox. The video I supplied show some of the buttons do not function.

Accessible Peephole

I understand your request for documentation supporting the need for a wheelchair-accessible peephole. I will provide a supporting letter from my healthcare provider confirming this need. However, I note that the unit door already contains an unused hole at wheelchair height and the modification requested would involve installation of a peephole in an existing opening rather than modification of the door structure.

I have previously provided to yourself as well as the City government links to videos that showed the parking lot as well as the nonfunctioning Intercom AKUVOX system. "Intercoms Update Dec 2025 Still Not working courtesy Mayor Karen Bass" <https://youtu.be/-t8zwONhfhY>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-t8zwONhfhY>

At least three of the units are not even listed on the "call" function for the Intercom. New owners purchased the building in 2014 and in 2021. The issue of reasonable accommodation for the requested housing services has not been part of any judicial proceeding, nor has there been any judicial decision regarding reasonable accommodation for these requested housing services.

The owner of the property receives about \$37,800 in monthly rent receipts from this property. Unless the owner is in some type of bankruptcy proceeding, which would be a matter of public record, the owner has no valid reason to claim financial hardship Financial.

Next Steps

I remain willing to work cooperatively to resolve these matters. If we are unable to reach a resolution, I may need to pursue review through appropriate housing authorities, including the Los Angeles Housing Department, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, or other applicable agencies.

I hope we can resolve these issues promptly and amicably.

Sincerely,



March 09, 2026

Geary Johnson
1522 Hi Point St #9
Los Angeles, Ca 90035

Dear Geary Johnson,

We are writing in response to your recent requests regarding parking assignments and unit modifications. Please see our position on these matters outlined below:

1. Request for Additional Parking

Regarding your request for extra parking at the premises, please be advised that this matter has been thoroughly litigated. Four separate court cases of your choosing have already ruled that you are not entitled to additional parking.

- Legal Precedent: In the second case, the court explicitly ruled that res judicata applies (as noted in the docket), and two subsequent cases reached the same conclusion in our favor.
- Documentation: Attached for your records are all four case dockets, including the most recent ruling which incorporates the findings of the previous cases by reference.
- Prior Offers: Notwithstanding these rulings, we have previously offered to rent you a tandem stall, an offer you declined. Providing a free tandem spot constitutes an undue financial burden on the owner, as detailed in our prior correspondence.

2. Parking Stall Reassignment

- Upon reviewing the premises, you are currently assigned to the parking stall closest to your unit (and per your lease). No further reassignment is available at this time.
- If you would like to LEASE an additional TANDEM space, this is separate from your current lease, and we are willing to lease it to you under a separate agreement for \$150.00 per month. This can only be done AFTER you sign a garage/parking/storage agreement separate from your lease.

3. Request for Wheelchair Accessible Peephole

We have received your new request regarding the use of a wheelchair and the need for a lowered, wheelchair-accessible peephole. As this is a new accommodation request,

we kindly ask that you provide supporting documentation, such as a letter from your healthcare provider, confirming the medical necessity for this modification (i.e., verifying that you are unable to stand to utilize the standard peephole). Upon receipt and verification of this documentation, we will move forward with the installation.

4. Front Door Lock

Finally, we would like to clarify for the record that the lock on your front door has not been changed.

Please let us know if you have any further questions regarding these points.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas Khammar', with a stylized, cursive script.

Thomas Khammar

CCP 527.6

(b) For purposes of this section, the following terms have the following meanings:

- (1) "Course of conduct" is a pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time, however short, evidencing a continuity of purpose, including following or stalking an individual, making harassing telephone calls to an individual, or sending harassing correspondence to an individual by any means, including, but not limited to, the use of public or private mails, interoffice mail, facsimile, or email. Constitutionally protected activity is not included within the meaning of "course of conduct."
- (2) "Credible threat of violence" is a knowing and willful statement or course of conduct that would place a reasonable person in fear for the person's safety or the safety of the person's immediate family, and that serves no legitimate purpose.
- (3) "Harassment" is unlawful violence, a credible threat of violence, or a knowing and willful course of conduct directed at a specific person that seriously alarms, annoys, or harasses the person, and that serves no legitimate purpose. The course of conduct must be that which would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress, and must actually cause substantial emotional distress to the petitioner.

Response to Property Owner letter of March 6. Subject Supplemental Clarification Regarding Parking Stall Assignment and Lease Limitation

You have confused the apt door key with the building key

“In the meantime, the owner changed the locks on the front door of the building but has not given key copies to the Blacks who complained, endangering the health and safety of Black tenants. This also endangers the safety, health, and welfare of tenants: the Black has trouble driving with the sign on the window and that endangers his safety and others since he is obstructed from looking out the window. In fact, because of the obstruction, he could actually hit some of the other tenants.” Thursday, February 26, 2026 at 09:47 AM PST. Received by Resident Manager Brian Vasquez via email, Power Property employee.

I checked the building front door lock just now and the key is still unusable.

Dear Power Property Management at 8885 Venice Blvd Suite 205 Los Angeles 90034.

I am responding to the letter of March 9, 2026 from Thomas Khammar (attached). The letter is not acceptable as a resolution to the issues at hand.

You mentioned that you were responding to my recent request, but you do not specify which communications by date that you are referring to.

1. “Request for Additional Parking

Regarding your request for extra parking at the premises, please be advised that this matter has been thoroughly litigated. Four separate court cases of your choosing have already ruled that you are not entitled to additional parking.

- Legal Precedent: In the second case, the court explicitly ruled that res judicata applies (as noted in the docket), and two subsequent cases reached the same conclusion in our favor.
- Documentation: Attached for your records are all four case dockets, including the most recent ruling which incorporates the findings of the previous cases by reference.
- Prior Offers: Notwithstanding these rulings, we have previously offered to rent you a tandem stall, an offer you declined. Providing a free tandem spot constitutes an undue financial burden on the owner, as detailed in our prior

correspondence.”

MY RESPONSE ON THE REQUESTED HANDICAPPED PARKING STALL

Add regards to court matters, and as I have stated to you previously in writing, contrary to your reconstruction of matters, there are three court rulings in my favor. Without looking at that ruling and admitting them, there is no validity to your statements and your position is FALSE.

You stated that the two subsequent cases were in your favor, but they were not in your favor as I have pointed out in writing. A court that dismisses a case “without prejudice” means that the merits of the case have not been ruled on. One of the cases that you mentioned was against a different defendant so that does not become Res Judicata either. I nevertheless, and the last case which name and number you don't provide, the court ruled that she was considering new evidence. So that means even according to you that you will consider new evidence and the new evidence in this case is that I continued to be damaged, that I continue to pay my rent on a monthly basis, and that there's an issue of continuing performance and continuing damages. The intercom is non-operational and some units are not even listed. The prior court cases don't apply.

You cannot use the small claims cases as legal precedent, because there is no indication of what evidence the court considered in making its rulings. There is no written transcript of the hearings that you speak of. I believe the court does keep an audio record of those hearings, but nevertheless, it's true from the last hearing that the judge never stated for the written record what evidence specifically she might be considering for her ruling. Res Judicata does not apply.

Khammar failed to mention that he countersued me—a lawsuit of his choice—and the court denied his request for damages. Perhaps that is a Judgment in my favor that prohibits Khammar from now claiming the \$150.00 for parking.

As far as your statement, that you have previously offered to rent me a tandem stall, an offer I decline, that is FALSE. The rent check you endorse every month proves my desire and payment for the tandem parking, ENDORSED BY YOU. The previous arrangement by the previous owner which you have decided not to respect was that I could be assigned a tandem parking stall number 14 (currently unoccupied) if I was first come first served and paid \$50 additional. However, as you know, I'm already paying for the parking through my rent agreement with no extra charge. Since that time which was probably two or three years ago, I continue to ask for a tandem parking stall on the basis that I am already paying for the parking. Certainly you don't disagree that I'm already paying for the parking as part of the rent.

In order for your state, with any validity and not based on bias or retaliation, you would have to prove that there is some tenants in the building that are paying \$150 for parking because otherwise it's retaliatory against me and meant to single me out. As I've said numerous times before, please provide evidence of any tenant who is paying \$150 to park in a tandem parking stall. Your ads on the internet state that parking is included in the rent. No charge is mentioned.

Single car stalls are stalls 1A, 1B, 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9, 10, 11, 12. Tandem two car stalls are 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. Does Khammar disagree? 18 tenants, 20 total stalls but parking for 27 cars. Always looks like two extra stalls but $27-18=9$ single stalls. Einstein could figure this out.

I have provided a video and photographic evidence to you numerous times that there is a available parking stalls, and a lot at this location. But you who do not even live here and keep refusing that. When you went to court, I told the judge that there was additional parking stalls, at least five stalls. In the meantime, you claim to the court that there was one tandem stall available. Prior to that you told the court that I was already receiving a tandem parking stall. So now we can't really depend on what you're saying because I believe in one of your last letters you said that you're willing to provide you with the tandem parking stall. The problem here is that you have to prove that it would be a financial hardship for you to switch me to another stall. If you change the numbering of the stalls as I suggest, there is no financial hardship. In addition, you haven't provided any proof that anyone at this property has ever paid \$150 for the parking, you have not established that you've told anyone to pay the \$150 other than me, and you have not established that you wrote anybody else on the property telling them to park it would be \$150. At this point, \$150 is retaliatory and harassment.

Nevertheless, you cannot claim financial hardship because you have 18 units here and you have parking for 28 cars. There is almost always extra stalls available and even now they're extra stalls available because some tenants do not have a car. I imagine you're gonna claim that for tenants that don't have a car they have to pay \$150 also. This is assigned parking but it's not covered parking so I don't know how you can justify \$150 when that's what buildings are charging that are newer and also have covered underground parking.

Unfortunately, on this issue, your letter of March 9 has addressed the accessibility obligations of you as owner and does not respond to my need for the handicap parking stall. You have also not provided an effective alternative accommodation as regards the handicap parking stall or the Akuvox door entry system.

“Parking Stall Reassignment

- Upon reviewing the premises, you are currently assigned to the parking stall closest to your unit (and per your lease). No further reassignment is available at this time.
- If you would like to LEASE an additional TANDEM space, this is separate from your current lease, and we are willing to lease it to you under a separate agreement for \$150.00 per month. This can only be done AFTER you sign a garage/parking/storage agreement separate from your lease.”

MY RESPONSE ON THE REQUESTED HANDICAPPED PARKING STALL

I am not quite sure what you mean by no further reassignment is available at this time. That is because I have photographed numerous parking spaces that remain vacant over the last couple of months. I even talked to one of the newer tenants who said that his stall was vacant because he doesn't have a car and I believe they're at least three or four other tenants who do not have a car. I know that the tenant in unit number five (stall 4) does not have a car. So when you say reassignment is not available, you are not making a true statement. In fact, it is a false representation of the facts. And I believe therefore it is also retaliatory and harassment because I have complained. In order for you to prevail on that issue, you would have to provide a chart showing who is assigned to which parking stall and you also have to indicate who on this property is paying \$150 for tandem parking.

Stall seven is vacant, and stall number 13 —a tandem stall —is vacant and the tenant told me that they do not have a car. So in that instance, a reassignment could occur unless that tenant is paying \$150 for parking, which he said he is not.

As I said before, there's no provision in my rent agreement for you to be able to enter into a separate agreement for the parking or the parking fee. But I have requested a copy of proposed agreement so I can show it to a lawyer, but you have not provided it to me. In the meantime, on this issue, your obligation is to provide an effective alternative accommodation and since you have not done so, therefore you have denied the reasonable accommodation requested as regards parking.

You have been provided medical documentation, judicial accommodation recognition, DMV placard, prior four year assignment to a tandem parking stall where there's no fee that was mentioned, the building receives section 8 funding, there's no accessible spaces on site, your surcharge demand is retaliatory and not allowed under accessibility laws, two tenants are sharing the stall that we are currently parked in, and by your own conduct secured, on-site parking is a necessity.

Your letter is contradictory because you state there is no further reassignment available at this time. But in the next sentence you provide that you would be able to provide a tandem department stall if I paid \$150 per month so that is contradictory. Why would I pay \$150 per month if you don't have any stalls available? You have been given numerous opportunities to state who is paying \$150 per month for parking and you have been given numerous opportunities to state when was that announced to any tenants in the building as to the charge for parking. Besides retaliation and harassment, you are engaged in fraud and accepting government assistance for fraudulent purposes.

Your letter admits that the wheelchair accessible peephole, as well as the indication of wheelchair necessity, is a new accommodation request, and such by your own admission, was not subject to the court proceedings that occurred. I don't really think I need to provide a medical documentation at this point because I've done enough of that and there's already a peephole in the door —not an accessible one—and there's also a slot for mail which could be used to provide the peephole so I won't be paying for any of those type of modifications. Nonetheless, without waiver, I will seek documentation from my doctor. If you have proof I have a wheelchair, that should be enough justification for the accessible height peephole that I requested.

I remind you that the peephole requested has to enable me to see up and down the hallway to the front and rear doors—due to my vision disability, in part. I realize that many of the other units received such peephole —not height but able to see hallway front and rear doors- in 2014 - 2016.

You state that I am assigned to a parking stall that is closest to my door. I'm not sure how you could arrive at that conclusion because my door is not on the same side as the parking lot. Nevertheless, the requirement here is that you provide accessible parking that is closest to the accessible doorway. The front of the building has eight steps to navigate, and it is not accessible for a person with a wheelchair or walker. Therefore, the most accessible location would be one of the tandem parking stalls that would be nearest the rear door where there is only one step to navigate. The rear step is my request, although neither the front nor the rear of the building is accessible under the building code accessibility standards. As you know you did major renovations to this building in 2014 to 2016 and you also installed a new door entry system in the year 2023.

Finally, you are confused about the lock to the door that is the lock to the front of the building is the lock that is not working, not the lock to my apartment door. Sorry for the confusion, but that was clearly stated at my previous email to you. And the current resident Manager should have checked the lock because I'm sure other tenants have reported it.

Further, you stated that as regards parking "no further reassignment is available about this time. " as I stated, if you were to address the configuration of the stalls, which you have not then you could address both my disability access needs, and also the shared nature of the tendency. In other words, you could switch a person who is parked in one car in a tandem stall, which there is at least three tenants who are parked with one car and have a two car stall, and you could just switch myself and my roommate with that person(s). That is something you could do right away and is extremely feasible.

I remain willing to engage in the interactive process in good faith and request written clarification within five calendar days.

This is a city rent controlled building that receives section 8 funding.

Your letter does not address the vandalism that your company did to my car because I parked in a stall that was vacant or not being used. My car window needs to be cleaned of the permanent adhesive that you placed on it. I cannot even lower my window properly. I consider that retaliation and harassment since the stall I parked in was not assigned to anyone.

Because you have parking for 28 cars and only 18 tenants, you cannot claim financial hardship.

Please provide the application for the tandem parking so I can share it with other tenants and make sure to put down the fee.

Is lease modification, reasonable? Yes.

Has reassignment of parking happened before? Yes, I was assigned to tandem parking 2010-2014.

Are others paying \$150? No.

Does the owner conduct prove that parking is a necessity? Yes.

All rights reserved to modify or revise the content of this letter.



Geary J. Johnson, Tenant
1522 Hi Point St 9
Los Angeles, CA. 90035

Attach fax of March 3, 2026
Attach Khammar letter of March 9, 2026

Reference Council Agenda item G. Juan Johnson. Date Submitted: 03/04/2026
11:44 AM Council File No: 24-1454-S1.

Thank you for filing a complaint form

From: Civil Rights and Equity Department (noreply@lacity.org)

To: tainmount@sbcglobal.net

Date: Saturday, February 28, 2026 at 02:37 PM PST

Dear Geary Johnson,

Thank you for contacting the Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department in the City of Los Angeles. This email is to confirm that we have received your complaint submission. Your complaint reference number is DIS0002519.

We are in the process of reviewing your complaint form. Please be aware that filing a complaint form does not mean that a case has been opened. One of our team members will contact you shortly. If you don't hear from us, please contact us at 213-978-1845 and use the above provided complaint reference number.

Thank you,

Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department

City of Los Angeles

civilandhumanrights.lacity.org



[Unsubscribe](#) | [Notification Preferences](#)

Reminder on Applicable Building Codes re Intercom and Parking at 1522 Hi Point St 90035

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: vasquezbrian79@gmail.com; marke.bridge@lacity.org; vatche.kasumyan@lacity.org; germain.mendoza@lacity.org; masiss.andriasian@lacity.org; oigcompl@lapd.online; steven.harrison@lacity.org; councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org; councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org; councilmember.padilla@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; thomas@powerpropertygrp.com; frontend@powerpropertygrp.com; brent@powerpropertygrp.com; nisi@powerpropertygrp.com; 09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com; ramazanali.almasi@lacity.org; kevin.brown@lacity.org; benjamin@powerpropertygrp.com; maintenance@powerpropertygrp.com; luis@powerpropertygrp.com; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; david@powerpropertygrp.com; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org

Cc: rene.flores@lacity.org; phillip.munguia@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 at 09:32 AM PST

Dear Rene Flores, Philip Munguia, Mayor Karen Bass, et al:

See attached fax to property owner, as text copied below.

1. See attached fax on car damages. Please remove the permanent adhesive sign that your employees placed on my car. I note that the cars of white tenants in the property were not damaged in the same manner.
2. I am a Black male senior citizen tenant with a documented disability.
3. The State of California has assigned me a handicapped parking placard.
4. PLUMBING There is a foul odor coming from the bathroom sink underneath. I think the drain may be clogged. Please send out a plumber.
5. Under the applicable building codes, and particular section starting with 11A-708, 11B-708, and 1109A and 1109A.4, there must be an accessible intercom system on this property which includes indoor monitors, and there must be accessible parking stall(s). There are no indoor interface monitors for the units or for mine. Please provide the monitor today without delay.
6. The applicable building codes require signage on the front of the building indicating how to use the Akuvox door entry system. Please post the signage.

7. As I have said many times, the intercom function is not working because there is no indoor monitor. In addition, as I have provided the video link, some apartments are not listed on the "call" directory means the system it is not fully operational.
8. Your company has never provided me with the written instructions on how to use Akuvox. You installed the system in 2023.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099



2026-2-27 Fax to PPM re Car Damage and Other Housing.pdf
32.7 kB



2026-3-5 Fax to PPM re Intercom and Parking.pdf
64.4 kB



An Official Website of the City of Los Angeles

City Directory



[Housing](#) [Community Resources](#) [Residents](#)



English ▼

[Rental Property Owners](#) [Partners](#)

[Strategic Engagement](#) [United To House LA \(ULA\)](#)

[Forms](#) [Contact Us](#)

[Home](#)

[Housing](#)

[Housing Programs](#)

[Accessible Housing Program](#)

[Accessible Housing Program \(AcHP\)](#)

[Search For Housing](#)

[Housing Programs](#)

[Housing Developme](#)

[Quick Links](#)

:

[Announc](#)



Print

Announcements



ACCESSIBLE HOUSING PROGRAM (AcHP) OVERVIEW


The Accessible Housing Program (AcHP) ensures equal housing opportunities for people with disabilities in properties that receive financial or other assistance from the City of Los Angeles or the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA/LA).

AcHP applies to more than 730 affordable rental housing developments built before April 2016, as well as all housing developments with five or more units that were designed,

Forms

Ask Housing

Search



constructed, altered, operated, administered, or financed by the City — they are collectively known as Covered Housing Developments.

AChP serves to facilitate the following:

1. Ensure that at least 4,000 units in the existing Covered Housing Developments meet federal and state accessibility requirements, and contain the required number of:
 - a. Mobility Units designed for people who have mobility disabilities, including people who use wheelchairs;
 - b. Hearing/Vision Units designed with features for people with hearing and vision disabilities;
2. Ensure that all rental housing financed or assisted by the City or the CRA/LA meet all federal and state accessibility requirements;
3. Require Covered Housing Developments to adopt and implement the City's Policies and Forms related to accessibility and rights for people with disabilities;
4. Provide training to property owners and management staff of Covered Housing Developments on required accessibility and non-discrimination laws, regulations, and policies;
5. Develop a Unit Utilization Plan that will apply to all Covered Housing Developments to maximize the occupancy of the Accessible Housing Units by individuals who need the features of the unit.
6. Develop an Enhanced Housing Accessibility Program for Individuals with Disabilities to meet the housing-related accessibility needs of an individual with disabilities;
7. Provide a Grievance Procedure; and
8. Maintain an Accessible Housing Registry website that allows

people with disabilities to identify accessible, affordable units in Covered Housing Developments, apply online to rent vacant units, be placed on accessible unit waiting lists in existing developments, and learn when vacant units are available.

The Accessible Housing Program is administered by the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) on behalf of the City.

External Program Reviews

The City has contracted with Abt Associates (Abt) and its partners, E&A Team and Vital Research, to conduct external reviews of the program. If your property is selected for review, you are required to participate in order to comply with AcHP. The review team will request documents, and conduct interviews with owners, property managers, and selected residents. If you have any questions, please email lahd.achppolicy@lacity.org.

What is a Disability?

Find out the definition of disability under fair housing laws.

[View >](#)

Settlement Agreement and Voluntary Compliance Agreement

Overview of the Settlement Agreement and Voluntary Compliance Agreement

[View >](#)

Resources for Tenants and Landlords

Resources for assistance and information on fair housing, effective communications, landlord/tenant and more.

[View >](#)

Contact Information

Contact information for LAHD's Accessible Housing Program and the Department on Disability.

[View >](#)



Check out our AcHP Videos!

Stay informed and up to date by watching our latest AcHP webinars and training sessions on YouTube. Learn more about the program, get guidance, and explore helpful resources—all at your convenience.

Select Language

Powered by  Google Translate

This form can be translated into multiple languages by selecting the Google translate drop-down menu at the top of this form. If you are experiencing any difficulty accessing this form or would like any additional assistance in completing this form due to a disability, please send us an email at civilandhumanrights@lacity.org.

Instructions

Please complete all the fields indicated in the form below. In order for us to better serve you; please be sure to include a valid email and phone number where we can reach you.

Authority: The Los Angeles Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department (LA Civil Rights) has authority to investigate claims of discrimination in the private sector only. Alleged discriminatory practices must meet the following criteria:

1. Must have taken place **within the City of Los Angeles**.
2. Must be within **three years** of the intake form submission date.
3. Must be in the **private sector** only including commerce, education, employment and housing.
4. Must pertain to **one of the protected classes**.

LA Civil Rights does not have the authority to investigate complaints against public entities including other city departments, or complaints related to discrimination in employment and housing which are encompassed by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA).

For assistance with discrimination complaints that are Not within the purview of LA Civil Rights or claims outside of the City of Los Angeles, please visit our resources page here.

State Law: State law controls the enforcement of housing and employment violations for certain protected classes. Filing a discrimination complaint with LA Civil Rights does not preclude pursuing any other available remedies.

Confidentiality: Please note that personal, identifying information entered into this form will remain confidential to the extent permitted by law unless and until the complaint proceeds to a Notice of Violation issued by LA Civil Rights to the respondent.

Retaliation Prohibited: Retaliation against any person for exercising rights protected by the City of Los Angeles' Civil Rights Law is prohibited.

* Required Fields

Location where the alleged incident occurred

Before we begin, we need to confirm that the incident occurred in the City of Los Angeles.

Incident Street Address *

1522 S HI POINT ST, 90035

Suite/Unit

9

Date of incident *

02-06-2026



Please enter a valid Date (Date must not be in the future, or longer than 2 years

- ago. Cases that are older than 2 years will be outside the statute of limitation, and we will not be able to move forward with the case.)

Your Information

Please provide at least one way for us to contact you (phone number or email).

First Name *

Geary

Middle Name

Juan

Last Name *

Johnson

Email Address

tainmount@sbcglobal.net

Phone Number

Home Address *

323-807-3099

1522 Hi Point Street 9

☐ Do you require reasonable accommodation for any disabilities?

Do you require language assistance or translation services? If so, which language?

Select one

Demographic Information

Please provide the following demographic information (optional)

Age

- ☐ Under 18
☐ 18 - 25
☐ 26 - 45
☐ 46 - 65
☒ Over 65

Annual Income

- ☐ Below \$30K
☒ \$30K - \$60K
☐ \$60K - \$80K
☐ \$80K - \$100K
☐ Over \$100k

Race/Ethnicity (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☒ Black or African American
☐ Asian
☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
☐ Hispanic or Latino
☐ White
☐ Other

Employment

- ☐ Unemployed
☐ Student
☐ Part-Time Employment
☒ Full-Time Employment
☐ Retired
☐ Active Duty Military
☐ Veteran

Education

- ☐ Some High School
☐ High School Diploma or GED
☐ Vocational/Trade School
☒ Some College
☐ College Graduate
☐ Masters and above

Identifying Gender

male

Sexual Orientation

Representation

Legal representation is not required to file a discrimination complaint.

☐ Check this box if you have an attorney or advocacy agency representing you

Information about the person or entity that you believe has discriminated against you

☒ Is the information you are providing about an entity?

Organization Name *

Hi Point 1522 LLC

Phone number *

310-593-3955

☐ Check this box if the address of the person/organization you are filing against is the same as the incident location

Street Address

8885 Venice Blvd

Suite/Unit

205

City

Los Angeles

Zipcode

90034

Email Address

vasquezbrian79@gmail.com

Tell Us What Happened

What type of discrimination occurred? *

Housing (landlord/tenant disputes in private housing only)

Which of the following protected classes pertain to your discrimination complaint? (Check all that apply) *

- ☐ Age
- ☐ Citizenship Status
- ☐ Color
- ☒ Disability
- ☐ Employment Status
- ☐ Ethnicity
- ☐ Gender, Gender Identity or Gender Expression
- ☐ Genetic Information
- ☐ Marital Status
- ☒ Medical Condition
- ☐ Military Status
- ☐ National Origin
- ☐ Partnership Status
- ☐ Primary Language
- ☐ Race (actual or perceived)
- ☐ Religion/Creed
- ☐ Sexual Orientation
- ☐ Source of Income
- ☐ Veteran Status

Please provide a brief description of the nature of your complaint and the outcome you are seeking.

On or about Feb 5, 2026, I emailed and faxed property owner my Housing Reasonable Accommodation Request. This was predated by letters from healthcare professionals dated 4/12/2023, 8/11/2025, 1/9/2026, and 1/15/2026.

Do you have any documents that you would like to include in your complaint? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Please attach any applicable records below. Allowed file types: gif, jpg, jpeg, png, pdf, tif, tiff, doc, docx, xls, or xlsx

Click here or drag the file(s) into this box



2023-4-12 Doctor Tellez Pacific Oaks Signed Request for RA G Johnson.pdf
· application/pdf



2025-8-11 Housing RA from Therapist Wendy.pdf
· application/pdf



2025-1-14 Wheelchair Order.pdf
· application/pdf



2025-12-23 Kaiser Dr Thipp Housing Letter RA.pdf
· application/pdf



2026-2-5 Disability Complaint RA re PPM Hi Point.pdf
· application/pdf



2026-2-5 Second Fax PPM re RA.pdf
· application/pdf



2026-1-15 Copy Signed Dr. Kazmiroff Disabled Placard.pdf
· application/pdf



2026-2-5 Fax RA to PPM from Johnson.pdf
· application/pdf

Do you have any other active legal filings regarding this same matter?*

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

How did you hear about us?*

Los Angeles City Department	
-----------------------------	--

In investigating your complaint, the City of Los Angeles Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department may disclose your name and identifying information as necessary to conduct the investigation or for other appropriate purposes. *

☒ I Agree

I hereby affirm that I have read this intake and that it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. Any person who signs this statement and willfully states as true any material matter which they know to be false is subject to the penalties prescribed for Perjury in the Penal Code by the State of California , Sec. 118 P.C. I give permission to each named respondent to release to the City of Los Angeles Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department any records or other evidence relevant to the allegations in this Complaint including, but not limited to, internal investigations, personnel records, and medical records. *

☒ I Agree

Click here to print this form.

Upon submission, you will receive an email notification and a copy of your submission (if you provided an email above).

☐ I'm not a robot	reCAPTCHA Privacy - Terms
--	------------------------------

If you have any questions or concerns regarding your complaint or the complaint process, please contact the City of Los Angeles Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department at (213) 978-1845 or civilandhumanrights@lacity.org.

Submit

**Civil, Human Rights and Equity
Department**

City of Los Angeles
200 N. Spring St. Room 1525
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 978-1845
civilandhumanrights@lacity.org

© Copyright 2020 City of Los Angeles. All rights reserved.

[Disclaimer](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)



**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

Respond Within 15 Days

February 27, 2026

Geary J Johnson
1522 S HI POINT ST, #9
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Confirmation of Complaint Filed & Request for Documentation

Date of Complaint: 02/26/2026

Alleged Violation: Harassment

LAHD Case Number: CE320463

Housing Investigator: Astrid Bender

In order to conduct an investigation, the following documents are required to be submitted:

- Rental/Lease agreement
- Proof of rent payments (cancelled checks, money order receipts, bank statements, rent receipts): 3-6 months desired
- Documents related to
 - Harassment
- If applicable, all court documents
- If applicable, all notices from Government Agencies (Building and Safety, LAHD Code Enforcement, Health Department, Section 8, etc).

All documents must be labeled with your assigned case number and received within 15 days of this letter. If for any reason you cannot locate all of the requested documents, please submit those documents which you are able to locate.

Documents can be submitted to the Investigation & Enforcement Section at:

**1910 Sunset Blvd, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90026
FAX: 213-314-6279 EMAIL: lahd.rso.central@lacity.org**

If you have questions, you may call your assigned Housing Investigator at (213) 808-8977.

Thank you.



RENT

Tenant Complaint Intake Form

Select Language

Powered by Google Translate



PART 5: REASON(S) FOR COMPLAINT

☐	Unit Not Registered	If your rental unit is not currently registered. All units must be registered annually.
☐	Illegal Eviction	You received a verbal or written notice to move out without a valid legal reason .
☐	Non-Payment of Relocation Assistance for Tenant No-Fault Eviction	You did not receive relocation assistance fees due to a no-fault eviction .
☐	Illegal Rent Increase	You received a verbal or written notice demanding more rent than allowed under the RSO. rent than allowed under the RSO .
☐	Reduction of Services	(Applies only to RSO units)- A housing service provided to you at the beginning of your tenancy or included in the rental agreement has been removed or is no longer accessible. no-fault eviction.
☐	Failure To Post Notice	The property does not have a Renter Protections Notice posted in an accessible common area.
☐	Required Online Payment/Electronic Fund Transfer	Your landlord has requested that you submit your rental payments . only online or by electronic fund transfer .
☐	Illegal Buyout Agreement	(Applies to only RSO units) You received an offer or signed a buyout agreement in exchange to move out of your rental unit, and the RSO Disclosure Notice was not given and/or the Buyout Agreement is not in compliance with the RSO.
☒	Harassment	Your landlord knowingly takes actions that cause harm against you .
☐	Illegal Eviction Due to Tenant's Rent Owed Is Less Than the Fair Market Rent (FMR)	You received a written notice of eviction for rent owed, which is less than the FMR for your rental unit size.
☐	Non-Payment of Relocation Assistance Due to Economic Displacement	You notified your landlord that you received a rent increase of no more than 5% plus the percentage change in the cost of living, or 10%, whichever is lower. You cannot afford the rent increase and elect to receive relocation assistance to move out of the rental unit.

DO YOU WISH TO PROVIDE MORE DETAILS REGARDING THE ALLEGATIONS

As part of a long-standing dispute, about February 11, 2026, Thomas Khammar, agent for the owner Hi Point 1522 LLC, wrote me that he was going to provide me with a tandem parking stall near the rear door of the building. He said that the cost of parking would be included in my rent since parking was already included in my rent. I started parking in stall 14 which is a tandem stall that was mentioned in previous documentations. As far as I know, no one else was assigned to park in stall number 14 and I did not see anyone parked in stall 13, 14, or 15. I was previously told in writing that the parking was first come first served and then by the assigned number. A request to have a signed posted showing all the parking assignments was denied by the owner.

To submit this response, please click on the SAVE button.

SAVE

WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER A FAIR RESOLUTION TO YOUR COMPLAINT?

As part of a long-standing dispute, about February 11, 2026, Thomas Khammar, agent for the owner Hi Point 1522 LLC, wrote me that he was going to provide me with a tandem parking stall near the rear door of the building. He said that the cost of parking would be included in my rent since parking was already included in my rent. I started parking in stall 14 which is a tandem stall that was mentioned in previous documentations. As far as I know, no one else was assigned to park in stall number 14 and I did not see anyone parked in stall 13, 14, or 15. I was previously told in writing that the parking was first come first served and then by the assigned number. A request to have a signed posted showing all the parking assignments was denied by the owner. I was off from work on Monday, February 23rd, so I did not have a need to check my car. I have been parking in stall number 14 for about two weeks off and on. As far as I know, I was still assigned to parking stall number eight also. About 3:30 PM on February 24, I received a knock on my door and it was Benjamin Renkainen from the Management company. Power Property Ben said that I needed to move my car right away and I said why and he's said you're parked in the wrong stall and I tried to explain to him what Thomas Khammar had wrote and he didn't want to hear it and he just said I had to move my car right away so I told him I would be out within 30 minutes. So I was able to get outside and move my car in about 10 minutes. Unfortunately, I found that Ben, who was still in the parking lot as I moved my car, had paste notice with adhesive to my driver side door window telling me to move the car in 24 hours. I found this was unusual because I've never seen anybody's car ticket this way before although I had seen the tenant number five notified of his car having to be moved, but they left a note on his door, they did not attempt to damage his car and he is a white tenant. I also noted that they're white tenants and in tandem stall number 19 who have three cars that they are parking in a two car stall, thus blocking the laundry room and the garbage disposal. Since there is no posted list of parking assignments, there is no way for me to tell. Are those three cars parked legally or not? Nevertheless they are also white tenants who are not harassed about parking three cars. I called the management office right away and I spoke to Ben and also the receptionist and I asked that someone come out right away and remove the sign from my car because my car window was being damaged. No one came out to remove the sign I mentioned to them that there is a damage cost involved because I may have to replace the entire window or even the entire door. The physical damage to my car also will affect the resale value. I believe the action of unnecessarily adhesive on my car window was intentional to cause harm because they just could well put the notice on my door or knocked on my door or call me on the phone because they already have all that information and they knew that it was my car. This is akin to the landlord, trying to evict you and trying self eviction or punching you in the nose to force you to move out. The Property Management company for this location has no authority to damage my car for any reason. The owner is aware that I am a disabled Black tenant and I have requested parking that would be closer to the rear door of the building. By forcing me to move my car, Ben is denying me accommodation and accessibility. Around the same time, without no written notice on otherwise, the owner of the property changed the locks on the front door to the building. I have complained to the owner that they have not given us two keys to use the lock therefore we cannot use the front door with a key. The owner has not responded. I feel this is another act of harassment because I complained about denial of housing services. There are 18 one better departments here and there is parking for 27 vehicles. Harassment is defined as is "unlawful violence, a credible threat of violence, or a knowing and willful course of conduct directed at a specific person that seriously alarms, annoys, or harasses the person, and that serves no legitimate purpose. The course of conduct must be that which would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress, and must actually cause substantial emotional distress to the petitioner." California Code, Code of Civil Procedure - CCP § 527.6 In addition, the housing department says that landlord to pay be utilities for a tenant can no longer get a 2% increase on the rent. I have asked the landlord to verify what the true rent amount is, and they have refused to respond. This I believe is also another act of harassment and that it causes an extreme amount of stress, not knowing what the actual amount of rent is supposed to be. The pasting to my car door window with permanent adhesive, serves no legitimate purpose, and has caused me substantial emotional distress. I fear for my physical safety as a result of the conduct of the owner. According to Public Documents, Power Property Management Inc (agent for owner Hi Point 1522 LLC) employees include Thomas Khammar, Brent Parsons, Cynthia Reynosa, Benjamin Renkainen, Bessy Cerna, David Diaz, Luis Rodriguez, Nisi Walton, Brian Vasquez.

EDIT

<- PREVIOUS STEP

CANCEL

NEXT STEP ->



February 11, 2026

Geary Johnson
1522 Hi Point St #09
Los Angeles, Ca 90035

We are in receipt of the letter you forwarded dated December 23, 2025, from Dr. Christopher Thipphavong of Kaiser Permanente, that was sent to us for the first time on February 5, 2026. 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., Los Angeles, CA 90035 (the "subject building"), and your parking space at the subject building. We further acknowledge receipt of materials for the same request sent concurrently with Dr. Thipphavong's letter. As you know, we responded to the prior materials as part of the most recent lawsuit you brought concerning these same issues, which was instigated at or about the same time the prior materials were first submitted.

We still await the formal ruling for the most recent small claims lawsuit. However, as discussed at the hearing, you previously lost two prior lawsuits concerning these same issues, and thus the most recent third case (and any future case) concerning these issues would be barred by res judicata and collateral estoppel. See *Planning & Conservation League v. Castaic Lake Water Agency* (2009) 180 Cal.App.4th 210, 226 (res judicata bars "not only issues that were actually litigated but also issues that could have been litigated").

We note further the LAHD inspected the subject building and considered your specific complaints about the subject building's intercom system. In response, the LAHD held it will not be enforcing any correction to the intercom system, and the issue was fully cleared from its' inspection process. This evidence was proffered at the most recent small claims trial and is in your possession.

Turning to Dr. Thipphavong's letter, he recommends a "functioning [intercom] system in place to facilitate communications with persons coming to [your] home." However, as acknowledged by the LAHD, the subject building already has a "functioning system." Indeed, your roommate is registered with and has been regularly using the intercom from your unit (number 9). This evidence was also presented to the Court in conjunction with your most recent lawsuit, and is in your possession. Indeed, between November 17, 2025 and December 15, 2025 alone, your roommate successfully used the intercom system 27 times. Simply put, the intercom works. Dr. Thipphavong also mentions "your report of the present parking arrangement," but makes no particular recommendation regarding same. While it is unclear what you "reported" to Dr. Thipphavong, the issue was specifically addressed at the trial for the most recent lawsuit. The Court acknowledged (as in the prior lawsuits) that you are in fact afforded a parking space at the subject building as mandated by your lease and that you (or your roommate) is using it daily. Thus, we submit you are already afforded the accommodations suggested in Dr. Thipphavong's letter.

Your prior materials requested a separate interface screen inside your unit for the intercom, and

also that the building owner pay monthly costs for your Wifi access to use same. Notwithstanding the fact the courts (on multiple occasions) plus the LAHD have rejected that suggestion, we submit your request also amounts to an undue financial and administrative burden and especially (as here) when the intercom works. Thus, the building owner is not required to, and thus declines, to incur such additional expense.

With regard to the parking, the owner is agreeable to renting you an extra (tandem) parking space at the rate of \$150.00 per month. If you desire to purchase same, we will ensure your parking spaces (both of them) are the closest spaces available to your unit. However, the provision of an extra parking space for free presents again as an undue financial burden, and thus the building owner is not required to provide same. Please advise the undersigned whether you elect to purchase the extra parking space as discussed above.

Based on your prior communications, we suspect the foregoing will not comport with your expectations concerning these issues. However, the owner's position comports with the rulings of the courts for the three lawsuits you instigated, the LAHD's inspection in response to your complaints, your lease, and the law. That said, if you would like to further discuss or have other suggested accommodation(s) for the owner to consider, we remain as always available to discuss same with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'TK' or similar, written over the typed name.

Thomas Khammar
Managing Partner
Power Property Management

Questions to city employee Steven Harrison- Senior Housing Inspector

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: marke.bridge@lacity.org; vatche.kasumyan@lacity.org; germain.mendoza@lacity.org;
masiss.andriasian@lacity.org; oigcompl@lapd.online; steven.harrison@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org; councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org;
councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org;
councilmember.padilla@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-
dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; cd10@lacity.org; councilmember.park@lacity.org;
councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.soto-martinez@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; thomas@powerpropertygrp.com;
frontdesk@powerpropertygrp.com; brent@powerpropertygrp.com; nisi@powerpropertygrp.com;
09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com;
ramazanali.almasi@lacity.org; kevin.brown@lacity.org; jeffrey.bull@lacity.org;
benjamin@powerpropertygrp.com; maintenance@powerpropertygrp.com; luis@powerpropertygrp.com

Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 at 06:43 PM PST

Dear Senior Inspector Steven Harrison:

1. I was able to get a copy of your December 16, 2025 letter to the property owner that you would not be following up on the notice to comply slated appnt for January 6 re the non-working intercoms. I was able to get a copy of your letter by paying for a copy in the Superior Court case summary. The USPS Informed Delivery proves that I was never mailed a copy of the Court document that contains your letter. Your letter as filed with the Court proves to the Public the involvement in this matter by Mayor Karen Bass and Council.
2. You mention that Power Property gave you a "response". Please forward me a copy of their "response and repair effort" as you stated. I note that the Artolier system is still in the unit 9 and has not been repaired or replaced. The Akuvox on the outside of the building is neither a replacement or update for the Artolier since the Artolier is still in the unit.
3. You state there will be no further oversight of the intercom issue. Please state why you have failed to order the replacement or repair of the Akuvox system? Please state did you view my video link showing the intercom function of Akuvox does not work?
4. Please state the section of the city building code---past or present---that refers to the two way communication system requirements that apply to this building.
5. Please state where is the interface in my unit that the building code requires the property owner to supply.

6. Please indicate have you read and understood the building code that applies to residential multifamily dwellings and the two way communications for tenants?
7. Since the Artolier is still in my unit, and not working, what repair effort was made that you allege the owner made?
8. I have provided you video evidence (ignored by you) that the Akuvox intercom function does not work. When did you inspect the Akuvox intercom function before your decision to close the investigation.
9. Please provide proof if you have any that I am legally obligated to provide any housing services at this address.
10. Please provide proof that you have legal responsibility for my personal cell phone and WiFi connection.
11. Please provide your reason for why you feel Black tenants in this building are not entitled to an interface (intercom indoor monitor) in these units?
12. Please state do you understand and comprehend English?

All rights reserved.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

c: Luis Rodriquez@ Power Property Group.com
Bessy Cerna at Power Property Maintenance.com

On Tuesday, January 6, 2026 at 03:45:34 PM PST, G Johnson <tainmount@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

1. To whom it may concern: "I am not surprised that Steven Harrison – a Black man – is part of the cog in

the machinery that continues to deny Blacks full and equal housing services and I'm not surprised that Stephen Harrison is not able to read and comprehend English so that he would be able to view the video link below that (shows) that the Intercom system for both units is not working.

2. This is a review of today's court hearing case 25STSC03297 small claims against Hi Point 1522 LLC. The city government of Los Angeles is not named in this case as a defendant, but is mentioned in exhibits lodged with the court.
3. This review is meant to be indicative, but not all inclusive. I reserve the right to revise this upon a further examination of my notes.
4. I will probably refrain from going over my position statement on this simply because my position is well documented to the city for years and years and years.
5. It would seem like a simple matter, a very simple matter to ask for a repair and replacement of a Intercom system. It would seem like a very simple matter to ask for a reassignment from a single car stall to a tandem park stall. But in this case due to the intentional retaliation, racism, Nazi-KKK like actions, things cannot be that simple.
6. Lie lie lie. The racist City refuses to enforce the City building code Intercom two-way

communication law. Due to vicious racism.

7. Welcome to Los Angeles under Mayor Karen Bass.
8. Thomas Khammar appeared to represent the owner of the property Hi Point 1522 LLC. Khammar claimed that he had mailed documents to me and that I had received them. I told the court that I have received no documents from the Power Property Management. I have attached a copy of the documents that he claimed that he mailed to me and he did file those with the court. So since I did not have the documents, I could not comment on them to the court today. Khammar may not mention this in his documents, which were filed by one of the employees called Benjamin, but the documents may have been mailed out by certified mail, but the certified mail system by the United States post office shows that the documents were not delivered to me. I did note to the court that the documents were neither mailed nor faxed nor emailed or delivered in person but they could've done so if they wanted to otherwise I had no specific clue that any documents were being mailed to me. The documents that the owner filed with the court attached show that they were mailed allegedly to me by some type of legal service, but there's no way there would've been no way for me to tell that the documents were coming to me from the owner. I have complained that it was improper and biased for the judge to have told the owner of the property to mail me a certified letter.
9. I noticed to the court that the owner has been in the property over six times the last three months and no documents were given to me during those times or at yesterday's visit.
10. I also noted to the court that the owner had been in the property over six times the last three months and no repairs were made to the Intercom system.
11. Kamar said that the City code enforcement sent him an email saying that they were not going to further inspect the Intercom system as scheduled for today at 1:30 PM. However, no one in code enforcement notified me that they were not coming out for the inspection. No one from code enforcement emailed me that they were not going to enforce the nonworking Intercom system. Code enforcement seems to have taken the position that the Intercom system is working, in spite of the evidence to the contrary.
12. I have taken videos of the nonworking Intercom systems two systems as of January 1 and those videos have been ignored by the city government.
13. Khammar claims to present evidence to the court that my roommate has been using the intercom system. But a careful review of the evidence shows that my roommate has been using the door entry system, but there's no evidence he has been using the intercom system, which are two separate parts of the device.
14. Khammar said that if I want a tandem Park install that they would charge me \$150 per month. I noted to the court that the previous owner stated that it would be \$50 more per month for the tandem parking stall. I also know that charging me \$150 for parking results in an illegal rent increase. There was no indication at the hearing that Thomas Khammar had ever told me of the \$150 charge and he denied saying at a previous hearing that we already had a tandem parking stall. So this man is just full of lies and lies and lies. I doubt very seriously if he's going to put the \$150 offer in writing but that's how racism works.
15. Khammar felt that I should be using my cell phone to access the Intercom function. My documents to the court show that the owner of the property is obligated to provide the indoor monitor for use of the Intercom and that I do not have any legal obligation to use my personal cell phone for purposes of the owners Intercom system.
16. Khammar mentioned that the city government has been implicated in housing racism based on his view of articles on the worldwide Internet.
17. The Judge will issue a ruling in the next few weeks.
18. Steven Harrison is the City employee who claims in the December 16 2025 email to the owner: code enforcement had reviewed and accepted your response and repair effort for the updated Intercom system provided for the residence through our reinspection activities. Conducted thus far. There will be no further code enforcement oversight of the Intercom issue." I am not surprised that Steven Harrison – a Black man – is part of the cog in the machinery that continues to deny Blacks full and equal housing services and I'm not surprised that Stephen Harrison is not able to read and comprehend English so that he would be able to view the video link below that shows that the Intercom system for both units is not working. I am just not surprised. I told Stephen

Harrison in person that I do not have any legal obligation to provide my cell phone or Wi-Fi for purposes of the owner; I do not have such an agreement with the owner or with the city or with the Intercom manufacturer. I am not surprised that Stephen Harris does not understand and comprehend English.

19. The Judge was such an asshole---SUCH AN ASSHOLE---that when I said, I did not receive in any letter in the mail, she simply said well you need to check and see why your mail is not getting through. And I have the USPS service which shows any first class mail that's coming to me and nothing shows from Power Property.

I believe it is through the racism, retaliation and incompetence of city government code enforcement housing employees that I don't have a working Intercom system. I will be filing another code enforcement complaint and consider filing a claim for damages against the city government.

Is Steven Harrison able to quote the landlord obligations under the City building code on two way communication systems (intercoms) in residential multifamily dwellings? Steven Harrison needs to be fired.

All rights reserved

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

c: Benjamin Renkainen, Power Field Inspector, Racist Among Us, Power Property Inc.

Latest Video on Non-working Intercoms- December 25, 2025

"Intercoms Update Dec 2025 Still Not working courtesy Mayor Karen Bass" <https://youtu.be/t8zw0NhfhY>

[Intercoms Update Dec 2025 Still Not working courtesy Mayor Karen Bass](https://youtu.be/t8zw0NhfhY)





**Intercoms Update Dec 2025 Still Not working
courtesy Mayor Karen Bass**



2023-8-3 Letter Random RL Published.pdf
169.2 kB



2025-12-18 Declare PPM Ben re 3297.pdf
6.3 MB

~~Department of~~
Building

1522 HiPoint Street

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY



NOTE: Any change of use or occupancy must be approved by the Department of Building and Safety. This certifies that, so far as ascertained by or made known to the undersigned, the building at the above address complies with the applicable requirements of the Municipal Code, as follows: Ch. 1, as to permitted uses, Ch. 9, Arts. 1, 3, 4, and 5; and with applicable requirements of State Housing Law—for following occupancies:

Issued:

4/17/73

Permit No. and Year

LA 58664/72

2 story, type V, 124' x 59' apartment house.
18 apartments. 27 required parking spaces
provided. H-2 occupancy.

Owner:

Tony Carr-John Lopoch

Owner's address:

5900 Wilshire Blvd.


Address:

Los Angeles, California

Form B-95b—2M Sets—1-72 (C-10)

D. MCNICHOLS:jh

By



Revised - RACISM AND CORRUPTION CITY OF LOS ANGELES - Memorialize Court Hearing Johnson v Hi Point 1522 LLC and Power Property management

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: 09e41e7459a05677911c@powerpropertygroup.mailer.appfolio.us; cynthia@powerpropertygrp.com; brent@powerpropertygrp.com; frontend@powerpropertygrp.com; highpoint1522@gmail.com

Cc: gavin@gavinnewsom.com; hcidla.rso.central@lacity.org; hcidla.reap@lacity.org; mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org; controller.galperin@lacity.org; gilbert.cedillo@lacity.org; councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org; councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org; contactcd4@lacity.org; paul.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org; councilmember.price@lacity.org; councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org; councilmember.lee@lacity.org; councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org; councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org; councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org; info@housingrightscenter.org; contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov; jivar.afshar@lacity.org; fred.wong@lacity.org; lisa.yancey@lacity.org; joe.velasquez@lacity.org; bruce.todd@lacity.org

Date: Sunday, May 15, 2022, 05:53 PM PDT

Rent Control Agent Lies to the Court - racist Khammar speaks.

How the city government helps deny housing services

(1522 HI POINT ST IS A RENT CONTROLLED BUILDING ALSO ACCUSED OF ILLEGAL HOME SHARING)

Dear Hi Point 1522 LLC, Power Property Management, Liliana Morales (PPM), Ann Sewill, Director, Catherine Taylor-Gomez, Tricia Keane, Mike Feuer: KALEENA WILEY, Thomas Khammar, Brent Parsons, Liliana Morales, Jacqueline Gallardo, Jennifer Cleveland, Renee Henderson, Giovanni Dubon, Kassandra Harris, Kristopher Gordon, Jason Ortegon:

The new owner is Hi Point 1522 LLC, managed by Hi Point 1522 Managers LLC, managed by Hi Point 1522 Managers LLC, managed by Hi Point 1522 Managers Holdco LLC, managed by Todd Jacobs, associated with Hi Point 1522 TJ Entity LLC, managed by Anthony Jaffe. The property management company for this site is Power Property Management which is at the same address as the other 1522 Hi Point LLC entities above.

On May 28, 2019, court case 19STCV18302, Walter Barratt and Fox Hills Drive Apt, LLC and Power Property Management were named in a lawsuit for failure to repair a call -box intercom.

Los Angeles.

In another court case, naming Hi Point Apts LLC (owned by Walter Barratt), the court issued judgment against Walter Barratt and in favor of tenant Geary J. Johnson, thus attaching monetary value to the loss of intercom and parking services. CASE 21STSC04574.

In another court case, number 19STSC14394, the court issued judgment in favor of Geary J. Johnson, the court denied the cross complaint of Walter Barratt (Hi Point Apts LLC) and Power Property Management Inc., another win for Geary J. Johnson; the core action was dismissed without prejudice, another win for the plaintiff.

This shall memorialize and summarize the SC hearing held May 11, 2022. case 21STSC04819, Johnson vs Hi Point 1522 LLC and Power Property management. This summary is meant to be indicative but not all inclusive. All rights reserved. This summary is based on court filed documents as well as notes taken at the May 11, 2022 remote court hearing.

Numerous city officials like the Mayor and Council are named in Exhibits filed with the Court. "Answer" to SC-105 filed 2/7/22. Email dated Feb. 1, 2022, sent at 11:38 p.m. Exhibit 6.

This lawsuit I specifically asked the court to order the repair of the intercom and assignment to tandem parking. I also asked for damages.

Only the head of the management company appeared and he also appeared for the owner. Thomas Khammar is employed by Power Property Management and is contracted to Hi Point 1522 LLC.

Excerpts.

One of my exhibits was a Feb 1 email to the management company and owner. The Judge asked Khammar repeatedly if he had received that email in which I asked for the intercom repair and tandem parking. Finally Khammar admitted he had a copy of the email in front of him. The Judge asked repeatedly had the new owner received communication from me about the issues and Khammar said no. Certainly he did not deny receiving the lawsuit around February 22. Interestingly, the Feb. 1, 2022 email mentions that I had contacted the owner/management company "numerous times over the years or months" (new owner started July 2021). So basically, the new owner knew about the suit thru the management company.

INTERCOM

Khammar said the intercom is not working because the entire building has to be re-wired. I disagreed and I am not sure the owner was being truthful. The Judge seemed not to believe Khammar but I had no proof otherwise. Something I will have to do for the next hearing: get proof of what it takes to repair it.

PARKING

I am seeking a two car stall or parking for two cars. Khammar said that our current space #8 is a two car stall and he said it repeatedly. I disagreed and told the Judge our current stall is only a single stall and that the rent agreement says we have parking for two cars. Why would Khammar lie about this? There was no record kept of the hearing but I did take written notes.

I realize today that I think too slow. The hearing was remote zoom. My laptop was less than ten feet from the window on the driveway. All I had to do was ask the court to let me open the blinds and she would immediately see the **single car parking stall** behind me!!!!!!! Well, all for next time.

CONCLUSION

1. I think I have good odds with the intercom because I think the Judge could sense Khammar was lying. She can order it repaired, order damages, both or neither.

2. I think I have better odds with the parking. Khammar ---I think in order to avoid judgment---said the current stall is tandem. It all depends on who the Judge believes or how she reads the rent agreement. Since Khammar said we already have a tandem stall, she could order Khammar to show proof of the stall or she could just repeat that Khammar said we already have a tandem stall. **That essentially would be an order requiring them to provide the tandem stall they admitted to.**

FURTHER NOTES

The lawsuit also asks for damages under the city harassment ordinance section 45.30 municipal code.

Numerous city officials like the Mayor and Council are named in Exhibits filed with the Court. "Answer" to SC-105 filed 2/7/22. "The actions stated herein of Hi Point 1522 (LLC) are because they are racist towards me as a Black male. (Source: see Unruh Act)." (p. 4). "The actions of the defendants are intractable, tortious, and racist, and are the cause of the damages to me." (p. 7). "What race do I have to be to get a working intercom? What race do I have to be to get a tandem parking stall?" (p.9)

Parking

The attached CFO for the building shows that stall 8 is a single parking stall. Why would Thomas Khammar lie to the Judge? Numerous pictures have been forwarded to Khammar of the parking lot and posted to the internet showing that stall 8 is a single stall.

Thomas Khammar has engaged in civil and criminal fraud. I believe he acts on behalf of the Mayor and Council and other city employees, and he represents the defendants. Khammar lied about the parking. Khammar lied about the intercom by telling the Judge that the entire unit must be rewired to repair the intercom. The truth is that the intercom breaker box and wiring is in the hallway; the entire unit does not need to be re-wired to repair the low voltage intercom. Khammar commits criminal fraud on behalf of the Mayor and city council and other government housing employees. Khammar is an example of the city government corruption.

I ask that Khammar write the Judge, and copy the LA County District attorney and Police and myself, that you acted on behalf of the mayor and council, and that you lied under oath for purposes of criminal fraud

and taking of rent monies to lie that stall #8 is a tandem stall when you know that stall 8 is a single car stall. Also indicate in your letter that you lied about the need for re-wire of the entire unit to repair the intercom.

The court heard the case without defendants filing an authorization to appear, as the court noted, and the court allowed them to submit an authorization to appear after the case was heard. (IMO sounds improper.)

The court did not rule on the Def. request for Judicial notice, as she noted that such document cannot be submitted in small claims cases.

The defendants claimed res judicata based on a previous lawsuit but the Judge noted that the parties in the previous lawsuit (dismissed without prejudice) were not the same parties as the current lawsuit.

Notes from hearing

COURT: I will hear from Mr. Johnson first. You have the burden of proof.

JOHNSON: Thank you, your honor. I speak here today and my testimony is based on every document that is on file in this action. I do want to remind the court that your honor did hear a different case on this issue but similar facts. You heard it was versus the same Power Property Management that appears here today. And in that case you dismissed it without prejudice. So I wanted to bring to your attention I may be repeating facts brought to your attention in a different case number and different time period.

COURT: The court is aware that requests for orders have been made by both the Plaintiff and the Defendant on this matter. The defendant has alleged that the issues that are going to be raised in today's claim for \$7,820 in damages, have already been ruled on by the Court. The court did not grant or deny the requests for orders; it merely stated those would be addressed at today's hearing on the trial on the merits. So there are issues of res judicata in the court's opinion that may apply to this claim, however I am going to hear the matter on the merits first before making any determination on the prior case being referenced by Mr. Johnson applies and that was case number 19STSC14394.

JOHNSON: It is a landlord tenant situation. I have been trying to get repairs to my intercom system for over 3 years. It is an 18 unit building and fifteen units the intercom has ben repaired or replaced. For some reason the owner does not want to repair mine even though I pay rent every month about \$1500 and the last twelve months I have paid \$18,000 in rent and the repairs have not been made. I do have a picture in my exhibits of the intercom that is in my unit (since the hearing is by remote zoom, I hold up the new intercom part back and front for the court to see). I will show it to you. This is just the one I bought from Amazon for \$21.00. And the owner refuses to install it. The owner refuses to respond to my requests for repairs. That is kinda why we ended up on court. I have spent money trying to get it repaired; I have not been able to get a maintenance person myself because when they find out I don't own the building, they will not talk to me. I put in an alarm system to try to compensate and the alarm system costs me about \$65.00 per month the last three years. The second issue here is the parking stall.

The rent agreement shows we contracted for two parking stalls which was in the form of a tandem parking stall, which is two cars parked behind each other, and the owner took that (tandem stall) away from us. And the value of that, the owner says the value is \$50.00 per month and the city says the value is \$200 per month. So somewhere in there, there is (monetary) value to the parking although in our rent agreement it says parking is included. At some point the owner said we will give you the parking for \$50 more per month for an extra stall (or tandem) since we have one stall already, I believe in my exhibits I have a copy of that agreement with the owner and management company and that has not been (14:07) honored. They have refused to respond on the issue of parking. The parking is in a secured parking lot where there is a gate around the lot, so it is health and safety issue substantial to me because parking is important. I park on the street right now and I get damages from the sprinkler system and I did receive a parking ticket that would not have happened if I was able to park in the parking lot. I clarify that in the previous lawsuit it was a different owner; the owner now is Hi Point 1522 LLC. I have the different laws I quoted in my papers and if you have questions, that is my testimony.

COURT: (The court verifies that the building was sold in August 2021 to new owner Hi Point 1522 LLC but the management company remained the same.) (The court says the prior ruling in case 14394 applied only to the prior owner Hi Point Apts LLC).The court notes the current complaint is claiming damages from November 24, 2018 to November 24, 2021. The court says for that period she had already entered judgment for 14394 for part of that time period, for issues raised today, so the court says the date of this claim is from 8/1/2021 to 11/24/21 because this claim can only apply to the new owner. "I will let you address that".

(editor note: the court is disregarding the effect of the “without prejudice” ruling against Power Property Management, Inc.)

JOHNSON: The owner in the previous (case) hearing said the parking (tandem) was valued at \$50 per month. So the owner has offered, and I believe the new owner would continue that condition, that if I pay \$50 per month, I would get the additional parking stall. I am basing my damages on that.

COURT: Are you currently being given parking for one car?

JOHNSON: Yes.

COURT: So it is the second stall you are referencing?

JOHNSON: Yes, and I also received a street sweeping ticket for \$73.00 which I did put down as damages.

COURT: Do you have a car parked in the one stall?

JOHNSON: My roommate has a car also so he parks his car there.

COURT: So you have a roommate?

JOHNSON: Yes.

COURT: Is your roommate on the lease?

JOHNSON: Yes.

Khammar: "Obviously the plaintiff has sued us before, numerous times, four or five times, he has gone to fair housing and been rejected, he has gone to Los Angeles housing and been denied. Los Angeles housing, which is the Los Angeles rent stabilization board, it has an amenities reduction program, and if he lost an amenity, he is entitled to file for that under the Los Angeles rent stabilization ordinance and get a credit for it. Unfortunately he is denied because per his lease your Honor his parking space is number 8 which is a tandem space. Ok. I completely agree with the plaintiff that it is inconvenient to have two gentlemen living in an apartment with a tandem parking space but that is what is on his written lease. His lease says space number 8, tandem, he has space number 8 tandem, the reason why the plaintiff is confused, is when the prior owner purchased the building, in 2015 or prior, the owner at that time had extra parking available and sent out an email and said for extra money you can take individual parking, and of course he declined it, and life goes on. He got his space number 8. There is no

issue with parking, he continues to have space number 8. He has two parking spaces. One parking space that fits two cars. All that is referenced in his own discovery that he gave you and I apologize but I don't know how you guys are seeing it but it says Exhibit 4 (page 6 of 22) , you see a white BMW it appears and in front of it is the space for the other vehicle."

Comments by GJJ for this email:

(Mr. Khammar is correct that the space at stall #13 is a tandem stall. But stall #8 is not a tandem stall. The white/grey car in the picture is not owned by myself or my roommate. See picture attached which was used as Exh 4 by myself. Until today, I was never told that we are to park in stall #15. You can clearly see "13" at stall 13. Is this what Khammar is saying, that we are to park in stall 15?)

The court asked Khammar if he had any exhibits to submit. He said no. He said he would rely on the exhibits of the plaintiff.

KHAMMAR: : "In regards to the intercom, him getting an alarm system and because he does not have an intercom, does not even make sense, an alarm system is made for somebody to protect, to protect you from

someone entering his specific unit and so I want to make sure the court is separating the two, the intercom is to allow you entry into a building and/or see when someone is at the door. Not all intercoms allow you to open up the entry gate door. A lot of intercoms in the apartment I lived at years ago prior to being married with no gray hair and kids, the intercom would only alert me that someone is downstairs, I would have to manually walk downstairs and open the door to let them in. There is no security in the sense of an intercom. The intercom program, the intercom itself requires in order for us to do an intercom for the whole building, we would have to rewire the electrical per unit. The city of Los Angeles has a THP program...for when you are going to do extensive work in his unit. I believe back in 2015, he appealed and fought the owner on the THP program and the owner could have given him additional funds to vacate but why would we do any of that if we are giving him an upgrade. He did not want the upgrade and he fought us on the THP and at the time we just simply said no problem we won't do it. His unit and two others in the building do not have the updated intercom. (Editor note: All 18 units had intercoms which the owner decided were not working. The owner installed a new control box and only wired it to 15 units, excluding three units like mine but the city ordered us to pay for the intercom repairs anyway. The wires are in the hallway connected to a hallway breaker box). The courts are backlogged and we have three cases currently open for this same matter. I realize there are different parties and we are affiliated with each and every case. And the court has also ruled numerous times before on identical issues. Obviously he changes a few words here and there but there are identical issues and I have a list of them, the Inglewood courthouse ruled in 2014, Judge threw out the case. (Editor note: the issues were not identical in that case.). All he needs to do if he has a true issue, is go to the Los Angeles rent stabilization board, who will listen to his loss of amenities, and once again they are going to deny it over and over and over again. That is why he is not going thru the proper process."

Court: Let me first advise you. if the prior owners that were Hi Point (1522) LLC were the named defendants in this claim, we would not be hearing this claim. (Editor note: The Judge seems to be ignoring the definition of "dismissed without prejudice".) But since there are new owners, and making similar claims against new parties, that is very relevant to him being able to bring a new claim. Now, the three units that do not have updated intercom systems, how many units are in the building?

Khammar: He does have another case with us as defendant to the prior owner after you ruled on the prior case. (Editor: Not true. Khammar is confused. Only this case is pending. Another case, where PPM is not a party, is on appeal.) 18 units.

Court: You said the intercom unit to be installed for each apartment, would require re-wiring of the whole building?

Khammar: Rewiring of the electrical to the whole building. It is a hard wire electrical system, so in order to get it to the plate, that goes in front of your door, each unit has to be re-wired. I mispoke, I told you three units, it is actually only two units that do not have them (working intercoms).

Court: So I am a little confused. So you must have re-wired the whole building because 16 units have the intercom, correct?

Khammar: As tenants vacate, we go in and open up the wall, and do all that stuff.

Court: Why have you not rewired his particular intercom system?

Khammar: We have to do it by permit and in order to do work inside a unit, you have to apply for a tenant habitability plan (THP), the tenant has the ability to appeal a THP. Mr Johnson appealed the THP, therefore we said no problem. We won't do it on your unit. Since then, rates have gone up.

Court: Just so I am clear. In order to rewire an apartment unit in the building, you need a permit from the city of Los Angeles. Correct?

Khammar: Yes.

Court: In order to get the permit, it is under the THP?

Khammar: Yes.

Court: In order to get consent with a permit under the THP, the tenant must consent? Correct?

Khammar: The tenant has the ability to appeal it and be heard by a board as to why he is appealing it. We as owners have the ability to say no problem, we will back down since you appealed it. That is what we did.

Court: So you applied for the permits and you are alleging that Mr. Johnson appealed the application for the permit and the owner then just said alright, we are withdrawing the permit request because he does not want it. Is that all factually correct?

Khammar: That is all factually correct.

Court: When was the last time. If you can give me a date or a month, or a year, when you applied for the permit, and Mr. Johnson appealed the permit application? If you can only give me a year, that is ok.

Khammar: 2015.

Court: So that is the prior owner. From 2015 to the present date, has Mr. Johnson in writing informed the new owner I would like to have the intercom installed, I will not be appealing the THP?

Khammar: No, he has not.

Court: Has he told anybody since 2015 in the property management line?

Khammar: Specifically, your question he has not.

Court: Ok, Mr. Johnson, you have five minutes rebuttal.

JOHNSON: Mr. Khammar said I did not have any communication about the intercom or about the parking with the new owner. Let's see Exhibit pages 14-18, an email I wrote on Feb 1, 2022, this year, to the Property Management and the new owner, asking for intercom repair and tandem parking. So that is at page 14. Mr Khammar misspeaks about some of the facts. Obviously he knows and he cannot say I have not communicated to the new owner about the parking and intercom because when I communicate to the management company which is him, that is a communication to the new owners. Security, as far as the intercom, Khammar claims the intercom is not for security purposes, (I disagree), it is for security purposes. So you can screen people at the front of the building. I can't get my mail all the time, I can't get deliveries all the time, because mine (intercom) does not work. People are constantly walking thru the building because they got in somehow and there is no way to screen them if you do not have the use of the intercom. I believe the previous case was dismissed without prejudice and just from my standpoint, I am not a lawyer, without prejudice means that there was no adjudication of the merits in terms of Power Property Management who is the defendant here today. Mr. Khammar misspeaks when he talks about the tandem parking. Stall 8 is not a tandem parking stall. Number 8 is a single stall, only available for one car to fit. Mr Khammar knows that because he has pictures of the parking lot. He knows there is 18 units of apartments, he knows there are 20 parking stalls, he knows that maybe half of them are tandem, and half of them are single. He knows we are not in a tandem parking stall. And he has been the property management company

2014, 2015, they left and came back 2019 to now, they are the property management company and I have sent them fed exes, letters, emails, so he is well aware of the problem. Our garbage disposal was replaced recently, sink faucet replaced recently, smoke alarm was replaced recently, within the last 2 or 3 years. The intercom is just as simple to replace as those from my standpoint. I am not an electrician but I was here when 15 units received intercoms. It did not take more than 2 months for those repairs to be done. Mr Khammar speaks of the THP program but those units were not subject to THP because they were vacant, not tenants, and not subject to the THP.

COURT: (Interrupts) Let's just talk about your unit. Are you denying that you appealed THP?

JOHNSON: In the THP, he has to submit an application to the city, there was no mention, absolutely positively of the intercom system by the owner in the THP. I took the THP as an opportunity to bring up the intercom system between my oral testimony and written testimony in 2014-2015, I mentioned the word intercom 42 times and there was not one response from the owner's representative whether it would be repaired or not. I have never been told by anybody in the defendant's employ that they would have to do a THP in order to fix my intercom or anything else in my unit. Their THP application said that they were spending \$18,000 dollars---I have that in writing---per unit. I, as a tenant, have no way of stopping them from doing the THP, if that is what they choose to do, but Mr. Khammar knows that in order to do the THP, we have the option as tenants to stay in the unit, and if we do he has to temporarily relocate us at whatever cost that is, then we have the option to come back as tenants. It is one or the other, keep us as a tenant, or give us a buyout amount of money. They never never offered us a specific buyout amount of money and that is why we are still here. I tried to engage in that, but they would not respond. So basically his interpretation of the THP process is not correct. It does not take a THP for \$18,000, it doesn't take a rewire of the whole building to fix our intercom. All other repairs took half hour maybe 45 minutes and did not need THP. The intercom is the same thing, an electrical device, he already put a brand new system in, he does not have to get permits, he already had the permit to put fifteen intercoms in and it is a brand new box, I have it in my exhibits, the picture of the new intercom system, which he put in, in 2015. And he could have fixed mine then.

COURT: I am going to stop you, because what I have concluded is that neither you nor Mr. Khammar has provided this court for this hearing with any documentation other than your testimony sworn given regarding THP in 2015 your appeal so they could not install it nor evidence that there was an application to install it. Neither one of you have provided that evidence to the court.

(The Judge says she does not have the exhibit with the email Feb 1, 2022 and she asks me to fax it to her, which I do that night).

Mr. Khammar, did you get an email from Mr. Johnson, dated Feb 1, 2022, at 11:38 pm?

KHAMMAR: I would have to go thru my emails.

COURT: ----Sir, he sent you a copy of his evidence, I want you to look at the exhibits he sent you and under exhibit 6, he states that is pages 14-18, on one of those pages is the email from Feb. 1, 2022. I did not receive that in the exhibits, Mr. Johnson, but I have your evidence right in front of me as I am reviewing it.

KHAMMAR: My company is named in the email. I do believe we received it.

COURT: Read it to me.

KHAMMAR: It's a long one.

COURT: Did you get that email in the exhibits?

KHAMMAR: My office might have ---

COURT: ---Mr. Khammar, as you are looking at the documents in front of you, do you have Mr. Johnson's exhibits 1-8?

KHAMMAR: Yes.

COURT: Mr. Johnson, you need to send me only that exhibit. I want Mr. Johnson to send it to me. (By fax.) The court will not be entering a decision until after I get that email, so don't expect a decision for at least 2 to 3 weeks.

She also asks the Khammar to send in the authorization to appear, that was not filed with the court.

(Hearing was 51 minutes and 24 seconds).

(The court seems to have let Khammar talk **well over** five minutes.)

Khammar admits that his nationality had an intercom; so that appears to be saying that as a Black American, I am not entitled to an intercom, no matter how much money I pay. Khammar implies that a Black such as myself is not entitled to seek redress of grievances in the courts. Khammar has no respect for the law.

The Judge was Commissioner Emma Castro.

(One could wonder why is the Judge spending so much time on certain facts outside the 3-4 year statute of limitations.)

All rights reserved.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

1522 Hi Point St 9

Los Angeles CA 90035

P.S. Dates of written communications to Hi Point 1522 since August 2021 check, check, email, are rent checks Aug 2021 - May 2022 (where the memo line indicates payment for tandem parking and intercom repairs), emails Aug, Sept, Oct, Nov, Dec., Jan 2022, Feb 2022, March 2022, April 2022.

P.S. The three criminal lies of Khammar: intercom, parking, number of pending lawsuits P.S. the court does not keep a transcript of small claims hearings

ref: picture of my roommate car parked in stall 8 (circa 2014). Does it look like 2 cars can fit in that stall?

REF. TANDEM PARKING. Simply put, tandem parking means **you share two parking spaces with another person**. These spaces are located one in front of the other, which means that the person in the back has to move their car if the person in the front space wants to pull out.

ref. this email may be published to the internet by the office of the city clerk. CPRA REQUEST 22-4914. <https://recordsrequest.lacity.org/requests/22-4914>



1973-4-17 CFO HP Apts for DEFH Plot Plan.pdf
702.3kB



2014-12-18 Tenant #9 Parked in Stall 8.JPG
1.6MB



2022-2-4 Available Parking Cropped.pdf
2.2MB

Notice to the person being sued:

- You are being sued by the person you are suing.
- You must go to court on the trial date listed below. If you do not go to court, you may lose the case.
- If you lose, the court can order that your wages, money, or property be taken to pay this claim.
- Bring witnesses, receipts, and any evidence you need to prove your case.
- Read this form and all pages attached, to understand the claim against you and to protect your rights.

Aviso al demandado:

- La persona que ha demandado lo está demandando a usted.
- Tiene que presentarse a la corte en la fecha de su juicio indicada a continuación. Si no se presenta, puede perder el caso.
- Si pierde el caso la corte puede ordenar que le quiten de su sueldo, dinero u otros bienes para pagar este reclamo.
- Lleve testigos, recibos y cualquier otra prueba que necesite para probar su caso.
- Lea este formulario y todas las páginas adjuntas, para entender la demanda en su contra y para proteger sus derechos.

Clerk stamps date here when form is filed

Fill in court name and street address

Superior Court of California, County of
Stanley Mosk Courthouse
111 North Hill St., Room #113
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Fill in case number and case name

Case Number:

19STSC14394

Case Name:

Gary Johnson v. Power Property

Order to Go to Court

The people in ① and ② must go to court: (Clerk fills out section below)

Trial Date	Date	Time	Department	Name and address of court if different from above
1.				
2.				
3.				

Date: _____ Clerk, by _____, Deputy

Instructions for the person suing:

- Before you fill out this form, read Form SC-100-INFO, *Information for the Plaintiff*, to know your rights. Get SC-100-INFO at any courthouse or county law library, or go to: www.courtinfo.ca.gov/forms
- Fill out pages 2 and 3 of this form. Then make copies of all pages of this form. (Make 1 copy for each party named in this case and an extra copy for yourself.) Take or mail the original and these copies to the court clerk's office and pay the filing fee. The clerk will write the date of your trial in the box above.
- You must have someone at least 18—not you or anyone else listed in this case—give each Plaintiff a court-stamped copy of all 3 pages of this form and any pages this form tells you to attach. There are special rules for “serving,” or delivering, this form to public entities, associations, and some businesses. See Forms SC-104, SC-104B, and SC-104C.
- Go to court on your trial date listed above. Bring witnesses, receipts, and any evidence you need to prove your case.

Justice Council of California, www.courtinfo.ca.gov
Revised January 4, 2017 Mandatory Form
Code of Civil Procedure § 116.110(a) and

**Defendant's Claim and ORDER to Go to
Small Claims Court
(Small Claims)**

SC-120, Page 1 of 3



Defendant (list names):

POWER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC., A CORPORATION

Case Number:

19STSC14394

① The Plaintiff (the person, business, or public entity that sued first) is:

Name: Geary Johnson

Phone: 323-319-4280

Street address: 1522 HI POINT ST., APARTMENT 9

LOS ANGELES

CA 90035

Street

City

State

Zip

Mailing address (if different):

Street

City

State

Zip

If more than one Plaintiff, list next Plaintiff here:

Name:

Phone:

Street address:

Street

City

State

Zip

Mailing address (if different):

Street

City

State

Zip

☐ Check here if more than 2 Plaintiffs and attach Form SC-120A.

☐ Check here if any Plaintiff is on active military duty and write his or her name here:

② The Defendant (the person, business, or public entity suing now) is:

Name: POWER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT INC., A CORPORATION

Phone: 310-593-3955

Street address: 8885 VENICE BLVD., STE #205

LOS ANGELES

CA 90034

Street

City

State

Zip

Mailing address (if different):

Street

City

State

Zip

If more than one Defendant, list next Defendant here:

Name: HI POINT APTS, LLC

Phone: 310-895-6693

Street address: 226 CARROLL CANAL

VENICE

CA 90291

Street

City

State

Zip

Mailing address (if different):

Street

City

State

Zip

☒ Check here if more than 2 Defendants and attach Form SC-120A.

☐ Check here if either Defendant listed above is doing business under a fictitious name. If so, attach Form SC-103.

③ The Defendant claims the Plaintiff owes \$ 10,000.00 (Explain below)

a. Why does the Plaintiff owe the Defendant money? Retaliation; Harassment; Prior Small Claims Case# 14SO3695 Litigated 2014; Defamation; Frivolous Lawsuit claims with the City; Other Frivolous Lawsuits; Vexatious Litigant

b. When did this happen? (Date):

If no specific date, give the time period: Date started: JUNE 2014 Through: September 2020

c. How did you calculate the money owed to you? (Do not include court costs or fees for service)

LOSS OF RENTAL INCOME BECAUSE OF DEFENDANT'S ACTIONS

☐ Check here if you need more space. Attach one sheet of paper or Form MC-031 and write "SC-120, Item 3" at the top.



- 4 You may ask the Plaintiff (in person, in writing, or by phone) to pay you before you sue.

Have you done this? ☐ Yes ☒ No

- 5 Is your claim about an attorney-client fee dispute? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, and if you have had arbitration, fill out Form SC-101, attach it to this form, and check here: ☐

- 6 Are you suing a public entity? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, you must file a written claim with the public entity first. ☐ A claim was filed on (date): _____

If the public entity denies your claim or does not answer within the time allowed by law, you can file this form.

- 7 Have you filed more than 12 other small claims within the last 12 months in California?

☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, the filing fee for this case will be higher.

- 8 I understand that by filing a claim in small claims court, I have no right to appeal this claim.

- 9 If I do not have enough money to pay for filing fees or service, I can ask the court to waive those fees.

- 10 I have not filed, and understand that I cannot file, more than two small claims cases for more than \$2,500 in California during this calendar year.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under California State law, that the information above and on any attachments to this form is true and correct.

Date: 9/9/2020 HILPOINTELLC
Defendant types or prints name here

Defendant signs here

Date: 9/9/20 WATSEL BARROT
Second Defendant types or prints name here

Second Defendant signs here



Requests for Accommodations

Assistive listening systems, computer-assisted, real-time captioning, or sign language interpreter services are available if you ask at least five days before the trial. Contact the clerk's office or go to www.courtinfo.ca.gov/forms/Request-for-Accommodations-by-Persons-With-Disabilities-and-Response (form MC-410). (Civil Code, § 54.8.)



Need help?

Your county's Small Claims Advisor can help for free.

Or go to "County-Specific Court Information" at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/smallclaims

✓ This form is attached to Form SC-120, item 1 or 2.

- ① If more than 2 plaintiffs (person, business, or public entity being sued), list their information below:

Other plaintiff's name: _____

Street address: _____ Phone: (____) _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Other plaintiff's name: _____

Street address: _____ Phone: (____) _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

☐ Check here if more than 4 plaintiffs and fill out and attach another Form SC-120A.

- ② If more than 2 defendants (person, business, or public entity suing), list their information below:

Other defendant's name: Brent Parsons, Agent for Power Property Management Inc., A Corporation

Street address: 8885 Venice Blvd., Ste #205 Phone: (310) 593-3955

City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90034

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Is this defendant doing business under a fictitious name? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, attach Form SC-103.

Other defendant's name: Walter Barratt, Agent for Hi Point Apts, LLC

Street address: 226 Carroll Canal Phone: (310) 895-6693

City: Venice State: CA Zip: 90291

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____


Is this defendant doing business under a fictitious name? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, attach Form SC-103.


☐ Check here if more than 4 defendants and fill out and attach another Form SC-120A.

- ③ I understand that by filing a claim in small claims court, I have no right to appeal this claim.

- ④ I have not filed, and understand that I cannot file, more than two small claims cases for more than \$2,500 in California during this calendar year.

I declare under penalty of perjury under California state law that the information above and on any attachments to this form is true and correct.

Date: 9/9/20 Hi Point Apts LLC Sign your name 

Date: 9/9/20 Walter Barratt Sign your name 

✓ This form is attached to Form SC-120, Item 1 or 2.

- ① If more than 2 plaintiffs (person, business, or public entity being sued), list their information below:

Other plaintiff's name: _____

Street address: _____ Phone: (____) _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Other plaintiff's name: _____

Street address: _____ Phone: (____) _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

☐ Check here if more than 4 plaintiffs and fill out and attach another Form SC-120A.

- ② If more than 2 defendants (person, business, or public entity suing), list their information below:

Other defendant's name: Kassandra Harris AKA Kassy Harris

Street address: 1522 Hi Point St., No. 12 Phone: (213) 908-8008

City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90035

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Is this defendant doing business under a fictitious name? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, attach Form SC-103.

Other defendant's name: Cynthia Reynosa

Street address: 8885 Venice Blvd., Ste #205 Phone: (310) 593-3955

City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90034

Mailing address (if different): _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Is this defendant doing business under a fictitious name? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, attach Form SC-103.

☐ Check here if more than 4 defendants and fill out and attach another Form SC-120A.

- ③ I understand that by filing a claim in small claims court, I have no right to appeal this claim.

- ④ I have not filed, and understand that I cannot file, more than two small claims cases for more than \$2,500 in California during this calendar year.

I declare under penalty of perjury under California state law that the information above and on any attachments to this form is true and correct.

Date: 9/9/20 Hi Point Arts LLC Sign your name _____
Type or print your name

Date: 9/9/20 Wahel Barrett Sign your name _____
Type or print your name

Why racism thrives in America: Unfair Housing

LOS ANGELES — The question is: In America in the year 2018, why would two white judges not want a black man to have "full and equal housing services and privileges?" The judges were told the city of Los Angeles had granted tandem parking stalls and working intercoms to over 15 tenants who are white; that the City authorized the infamous Tenant Habitability Program, which entitles the blacks to a working intercom (at some time in the unknown future); that the City of Los Angeles had ordered the intercom repair or replacement in units where tenants are white; that the city had authorized the capital improvements for intercom system and charged the black tenants a rent increase even though the intercom for blacks was never repaired or replaced; that the owner told the Department Fair Employment and Housing he was installing brand new intercoms in units. So if not for racism and corruption, why did Federal Judges Julie L. Stanton and Andrew J. Watrich seemingly ignore their own city government agency orders, just to deprive a black man of rights?

In 2015, an administrative appeal has been filed to the City of Los Angeles regarding approved application for tenant habitability program. The Sept. 26, 2015, attachment to the appeal mentions the word "intercom" 47 times.

"FIRST AMENDED CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO 42 USC, § 1981 ("The 14th and 15th Acts") AND REQUEST FOR DECLARATIVE AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF"

Defendants: CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, (et al) and DOJES 1-10 inclusive. Case: 2:18-cv-02296-JLS-AJM. Central District Los Angeles, filed May 11, 2018. Latest claims included: Seven Federal law claims plus: (State law claims) Health and Safety Code 17925-17938; California Government Code sections 12940-12946.2 Housing Discrimination (CO 51.52 Unlawful Act and Unlawful Retaliation; CO 51.52 Conspiracy to Interfere with Civil Rights; CO 12940.1) Retaliation; CO 1942.3 Breach of Implied Warranty of Habitability; CO 17280-17210 False and Deceptive Business Practices.

Accounting/Co-Mingling of Funds; Consumer Fraud; Fraudulent Omissions; CO section 1940.4 Tenant Posting of Signs; CO section 1714(a) Negligence; CO section 1740 Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress; LAMC sections 151-155 Los Angeles Rent Control Ordinance; Breach of Contract Rental Agreement; CO 41.32 Implied Covenant: Quiet Enjoyment; Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing; Violation of Mandatory Duties Under CO 615.6.

"Unlawful discrimination can be circumstantial, arbitrary, disparate treatment, disparate impact, indirect, direct, or consequential. Yes, discrimination against individual rights may be actionable."

"Based on information and belief, Plaintiff states that thousands of tenants are at risk of the threat of injury due to the racist practices of the city and county government entities named, that such actions are pattern and practice of the city and county governments."

"42 USC 1981 - Equal rights under the law (b) 'Make and enforce contracts' defined For purposes of this section, the term 'make

and enforce contracts' includes the making, performance, modification, and termination of contracts, and the enjoyment of all benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of the contractual relationship." Thus the city government et al has participated in a denial to tenants #5 of the benefits, privileges, terms, and conditions of the contractual relationship as prohibited under 42 USC section 1981."

COURT RULING BETWEEN SEPTEMBER AND NOVEMBER 22, 2017. DOCKET ENTRY 117 (attached from 15 page ruling) "It is hereby adjudged that plaintiffs... state law claims are dismissed without prejudice, and the action is dismissed without prejudice as to defendants."

Note: The information above has been included from publicly accessible documents. It is intended to be illustrative but not all inclusive. The original court filed amended complaint is 205 pages including exhibits. The case can be viewed for free at the courthouse, or for cost downloaded online at pacer.gov.

Commentary by G. Juan Johnson

None of the defendants filed an "answer" with the court denying the allegations against them. The court denied parties discovery procedures and would not allow the case to go to trial. At one point, defendants properly served and their management company received a notice to deliver the tenant Plaintiff's "writings." The defendants asked for \$25,000 in advance fees and costs. The Plaintiff opposed the motion and asked for \$2 million dollars against each defendant and each attorney for the defendants' filing of a "writings" motion. The court denied the defendants' motion and denied the requested \$25,000. Attorneys and defendants asked the Plaintiff's, legal retention case to his case address. The retention case is used in court documents by defendants. 48 Point Apts. LLC, the State of California and the City of Los Angeles government and employees, as stated in court document 103, filed 11-7-2018, page 10 2510, paragraph 20. Lawyers for same defendants included Martin Agosin, Robert P. Moore, Mike Frost, Jared A. Barry.

"The Housing Department has determined this building to be substandard per section 24363.5 of the State General and Taxation Code. Any and all units are subject to re-inspection and require the same uniform compliance throughout the premises." Los Angeles City Code Enforcement.

I believe that the property management company wrote its government officials and said that the government had spent thousands of dollars to deny fair housing to Blacks.

Notes and laws: 42 USC 1981 - Equal rights under the law (b) 'Make and enforce contracts'

defined, 28 U.S. Code § 453 - Oaths of justices and judges; "A legal threat is a statement by a party that it intends to take legal action on another party, generally accompanied by a demand that the other party take an action demanded by the first party or refrain from taking or continuing actions objected to by the demanding party." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legal_threat; LAMC 41.33 "Peaceful Enjoyment"; LANDLORDS - DISTURBING TENANTS; TENANT RIGHT TO POST ELECTION NEWS California code section 1540.4 (a) and (b); CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 1 DECLARATION OF RIGHTS SEC. 7, (c); CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE, SECTION 49A-52.5; California Civil Code 1542.0 Resolution for Exercising Rights: Failure to Act in a Reasonable Manner.

Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stand_in_the_Schoolhouse_Door

I believe the country's government has a master plan to exterminate all Blacks in the next 25 years. Black birthrates are down, Asians and Latino numbers are way up. Where will YOU be when America becomes China? Did you know the term "Junior" originated from the term "Just Us"?

Nothing in this ad is intended to constitute legal advice. Reference public documents: State of California Department Fair Employment and Housing Intake 201712-00534122 City Los Angeles RSD-CE226942; Los Angeles Code enforcement complaints 846703 (filed 6/20/2018); and other communications to government officials. Your landlord is not a licensed utility company.



Stand Up Against Racism

As seen on Youtube at: <http://bit.ly/2E11z>

Please visit and share two great blogs:

LA Rent Control and Permits: <https://housingpermitsandrentedjustmentcommission.wordpress.com/>

• Communications with city employees • Dec. 18, 2017 letter to Sen. Holly Mitchell • Nov. 20, 2017 letter to FTO

Los Angeles Affordable Housing and Rent Control: <http://www.lahousingrentcontrol.com/>

The author is available for speaking engagements.

Which 2018 California candidates will support dismantling the Department of Fair Employment and Housing illegal pre-complaint inquiry that is used to unjustly stop residents from filing complaints? Will the California candidates for Governor seek an investigation into the discriminatory and corrupt practices of the Los Angeles Rent Control THP program?

This ad was written and paid for by: G. Juan Johnson (Jared-John-DNA-Komito/Black)

DO NOT SIGN A RENT AGREEMENT
unless the owner agrees to repair deadlines.

See 42 U.S. Code section 3604(b);

42 U.S. Code section 1981

"the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings as is enjoyed by white citizens"

See two great blogs - <https://wp.me/P57D2C-1>

and <http://wp.me/p6ztbL-1>

and YouTube channel <http://bit.ly/2EjL1Lz>

By G. Juan Johnson

SPACIOUS STUDIO • VIEW PARK

3/4 bathroom, kitchenette, lots of closets, cabinets, private entrance, gas, electric, water.

\$1700/monthly (1-year lease).

Security \$3400. No smoking / No Pets.

henrydchenry83@gmail.com



I'm covered because my landlord has insurance

Usually a landlord's insurance covers only structural damage to the building itself—and a lot of policies don't even go that far if the damage is caused by a tenant. For example, if you leave the tub running and it drips downstairs, damaging your neighbor's couch, you may be liable for the whole mess. If your building caught fire, your landlord's coverage would include repairs, but only to the building.

It's too expensive

Renter's insurance can be as little as \$10 to \$20 per month. It depends on factors such as the type of personal property you're covering, the size of the dwelling, the location and the deductible you want. Lower prices are offered for apartments that contain smoke alarms and fire extinguishers. For lower rates, you can raise the deductible; for more protection, you can pay more for replacement cost coverage.

My neighborhood is safe

Renter's insurance usually extends beyond on-premise theft and hazards. If your luggage is stolen while you're on vacation, you'll often be covered. The same may be true with property stolen

thousands of dollars worth belongings. Following is a list of common household items. List each item along with its year of purchase and what you think would cost to replace it today.

Types of coverage offered
Personal property coverage:

Coverage varies by state, company, and type, but here are some basic examples of personal property to include in your inventory. Items not listed here may still be insurable; ask your agent about customizing your policy with more options.

Property typically covered:

- Stereo systems, VCRs, and television sets
- CDs, DVDs, videos, and tapes
- Photography equipment
- Movable appliances, including microwaves
- Furniture
- Sports equipment
- China and glassware
- Clothing and books

Property covered with limitations:

- Home computers
- Cash, including coin collection
- Checks and traveler's checks
- Jewelry and watches
- Precious and semi-precious stones
- Comic books, trading cards.

Special Issues Sp



Spring Semester Final / Graduation
Thursday April 26th

- Last chance to advertise before final exams and commencement



ADS@DAILYTROJAN



“Every tenant in Los Angeles should understand their rights,

especially in a tight housing market, and landlords should know their responsibilities,” said Mayor Garcetti. “The RSO is the most powerful tool we have to keep families and neighborhoods together, and this ordinance will help protect vulnerable populations — like senior citizens and immigrants — from displacement. As we work to build new affordable housing, we also must make sure that residents know about protections that are already in place.”
December 15, 2016

From internet article:


“Mayor Garcetti Signs Tenant Buyout Ordinance | Office of Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti”


This ad paid for by G. Juan Johnson.

See the internet blogs:

**Los Angeles
Affordable
Housing
and Rent
Control**

**LA Rent
Control
(RAC)
and Permits
(LADBS)**







1522

HI POINT APTS

PROUDLY MANAGED BY

POWER PROPERTY

1 BEDROOM

WE HAVE OTHERS

FOR LEASING

Call Martisa

323.207.0833

GOOGLE

RACISM

HI POINT

APTS