https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2023/23-1022-S27_PC_PM_02-14-2026.pdf

Communication from Public

Name:	Geary J Johnson
Date Submitted:	02/14/2026 09:33 PM
Council File No:	23-1022-S27
Comments for Public Posting:	23-1022-S27. CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 11, 2026 City Administrative Officer report relative to Fiscal Year 2025-26 Third Homelessness Funding Report. (This item is referred to the Housing and Homelessness Committee and the Budget and Finance Committee.) This matter is supported because Mayor Karen Bass tells how to deny housing services to Black tenants . Attached. 1ST PAGE PC Agenda Feb 15-19.pdf 2021-7-1 PC Court Judgment Walter Power 4394 case.pdf 2022-2-16 PC Notice of Entry of Judgment Walter 4574 copy.pdf 2026-2-11 PC Letter from Thomas Khammar PPM copy.pdf 2026-2-12 PC Email from Thomas Khammar copy.pdf 2026-2-13 PC Reply to Khammar Feb 11 Letter.pdf 2026-2-14 PC Fax PPM copy.pdf Excerpt LAIST article regarding homeless property seizure by City Public Comment Submission Validation - Council File No.: 23-0600-S111 (No attachments) 2014-2-14 PC 2nd fax to PPM. How Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass' Government Denies Housing Services to Black Tenants https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLx6segjGNXiT_YjQ1wz84UFLjFD-GiqX6 https://wp.me/P6ztbL-i . Revealed Inside District 10 staff Heather Hutt Los Angeles Abuse of Federal Funds. https://lahousingpermitsandrentadjustmentcommission.com/revealed-inside-district-10-staff-heather-hutt-los-angeles-abuse-of-federal-funds/ . Owner Hi Point 1522 shows hatred of Blacks who complain about housing services. Staff Council District 10 Heather Hutt, Kimani Black,Andrew Westall, Emily Adsit, Alex Morales, Hakeem Parke-Davis, Gregory Earnest, Devyn Bakewell, Roger Gonzalez, Steele Bloodworth, Jeff Camp, Mayra Guevara, Diane Cho, Alan Antonio, Danielle Mero, Alisa Rivera, Jonathan Mitchell, Kris Simms, Frank Oliver, Robert Pullen-Miles, Roger Estrada, Terrence Gomes, Carl Young, Kimberly Valentine, Jenelle Henderson, Margarita Younkins, Jocelyn Padilla, Emani Byrd, Ricardo Carlos. https://wp.me/p6ztbL-qY “The judge found the city Los Angeles had acted willfully and in bad faith to deprive the plaintiffs of the information they requested repeatedly, and that the City’s explanation for misconduct was not credible, according to court documents. LAIST. https://laist.com/news/federal-judge-rules-against-losangeles-homeless-property-seizure-lawsuit-city-sanitation-fabricated-records To 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.rodriguez@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; benjamin@powerpropertygrp.com; maintenance@powerpropertygrp.com; luis@powerpropertygrp.com; je?rey.bull@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org Cc: david@powerpropertygrp.com. Mayor Karen Bass. Best Cerna, Luis Rodriquez. To: vasquezbrian79@gmail.com.

Facsimile
Thomas Khammar for Hi Point 1522 LLC
Fax 310-661-8185

From Geary J, Johnson
323-807-3099

Feb. 14 2926

1. You claim that your court filed December 18th 2025 document included the mention of the disabled placard plates as well as requests for handicapped parking stall. The handicapped parking stall disabled plates notice did not occur until January 25th 2026 and forwarded to you around February 5th 2026. Since it could not be included in the hearing on other matters, the disabled placards plate notice of Jan. 25. 2026 constitutes new evidence.

2. You claim that the city government code enforcement inspected the intercom system at subject address and determined that the intercom system is working. That is not true. The notice from code enforcement said that the system was not working and subject to repair. The email after that from Steven Harrison to you said that he was accepting your explanation that the system had been upgraded, however neither Stephen Harrison and nor anyone else from code enforcement actually inspected the AKUVOX on the outside of the building to see if it was working and the code enforcement employees did not view the video that I supplied that the intercom system is not working, and finally the city employees did not inspect the unit to see if there is an indoor interface or indoor monitor to connect to the AKUVOX, monitor as required by law . On what date do you feel that the city inspected the unit to determine the wired or Wi-Fi connection to AKUVOX?

3. As regards the tandem parking stall requested and also the handicapped stall requested. You seem to be confused. The request for the tandem parking stall which is a monthly request (see endorsed rent checks) concerning moving myself and my roommate two cars from the single car stall to a tandem two car stall.

In that explanation, I am requesting a stall that will accommodate two cars, I am not requesting parking for three cars. The most recent request for the handicap stall which would be for a single car is , without waiving any rights, could possibly be considered to be an alternative to the request for the tandem parking stall. I would accept the handicap stall for myself, and my roommate would remain in stall number eight. Or instead of the handicap parking stall, we would be assigned a tandem parking stall, which we would provide for two cars.The end result is that I am not asking for parking for three cars as you alleged. Your statement and your letter is, with regard to the parking, “owner is agreeable to rent you an extra tandem parking space at the rate of $150 per month.” Further you say " we will assure your parking spaces, both of them are the closest space available to your unit.” Thus I'm not asking for $150 space. I'm asking to be switched from single parking space to tandem two cars space. As I have stated numerous times, the rent agreement does not provide for the charge of $150 for any parking on the property. I'm not asking for two spaces as in “both” as your letter alleges.

Fax Details:

Fax ID: 2ea1a36a-301f-449d-b71f-0c381b29b217

Recipient: +13106618195

Status: delivered

Sent: February 15, 2026 at 4:48 AM UTC

✅ **Your fax was successfully received by the recipient.**

Thank you for using Faxly for your fax transmission needs!

Need help? Visit our Support Center

Faxly

1309 Coffeen Avenue, STE 1200

Sheridan, WY US

support@faxlyapp.com

WOW, IS THE OWNER CONFUSED. FOR YEARS WE HAVE ASKED TO BE SWITCHED FROM A SINGLE CAR STALL TO A TANDEM 2 CAR STALL. WE ARE NOT ASKING FOR AN ADDITIONAL PARKING STALL.

BUT LISTEN TO WHAT THE OWNER SAYS IN HIS FEB 11 LETTER:

“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.”

THIS IS A DUMMY I AM DEALING WITH. I AM ASKING TO BE SWITCHED FROM OUR CURRENT STALL, NOT FOR AN “EXTRA” PARKING STALL. WOW!

FEB 14, 2026

CENTRAL DISTRICT
Stanley Mosk Courthouse
111 North Hill Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

SMALL CLAIMS CASE NO: 21STSC04574

- NOTICE TO ALL PLAINTIFFS AND DEFENDANTS –

Your small claims case has been decided. If you lost the case, and the court ordered you to pay money, your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court. Read the back of this sheet for important information about your rights.

***- AVISO A TODOS* LOS *DEMANDANTES Y DEMANDADOS* –**

Su caso ha sido resuelto por la corte para reclarnos judiciales menores. Si la corte ha decidido en su contra y ha ordenado que usted pague dinero, le pueden quitar su salario, su dinero, y otras cosas de su propiedad, sin aviso adicional por parte de esta corte. Lea el reverso de este formulario para obtener informacion de importancia acerca de sus derechos.

PLAINTIFF/DEMANDANTE
Geary J. Johnson
1522 Hi Point St 9
Los Angeles, CA 90035

DEFENDANT/DEMANDADO
Hi Point Apts LLC
226 Carroll Canal
Venice, CA 90291

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

JUDGMENT WAS ENTERED AS STATED BELOW ON (DATE): 02/16/2022
Court orders judgment entered for Plaintiff Geary J. Johnson against Defendant Hi Point Apts LLC., (A Corporation) on the Plaintiff's Claim filed by Geary J. Johnson on 12/03/2021 for the principal amount of $479.99 and costs of $90.00 for a total of $569.99.

Waived fees and costs in the amount of $50.00, including those incurred after judgment, must be paid directly to the court by Defendant Hi Point Apts LLC., (A Corporation). A full or partial satisfaction of judgment will not be entered unless waived fees are paid per Government Code section 68637(b)(1). An Administrative fee of $25.00 must be assessed if the collection process is initiated to collect unpaid fees per Government Code section 68638.

Enforcement of the judgment is automatically postponed for 30 days or, if an appeal is filed, until the appeal is decided.

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING - I certify that I am not a party to this action. This *Notice of Entry of Judgment* was mailed first class, postage prepaid, in a sealed envelope to the parties at the addresses shown above. The mailing and this certification occurred at the place and on the date shown below.

Place of mailing: Los Angeles CA 90012
Date of mailing: 02/16/2022

Clerk by [redacted]**, Deputy**

- **The county provides small claims advisor services free of charge. Read the information sheet on the reverse.**

INFORMATION AFTER JUDGMENT / *INFORMACION DESPUES DEL FALLO DE LA CORTE*

Your small claims case has been decided. The **judgment** or decision of the court appears on the front of this sheet. The court may have ordered one party to pay money to the other party. The person (or business) who won the case and who can collect the money is called the **judgment creditor.** The person (or business) who lost the case and who owes the money is called the **judgment debtor.**

Enforcement of the judgment is postponed until the time for appeal ends or until the appeal is decided. This means that the judgment creditor cannot collect any money or take any action until this period is over. Generally, both parties may be represented by lawyers after judgment.

IF YOU LOST THE CASE . . .

1 . If you lost the case on your own claim and the court did not award you any money, the court's decision on your claim is **FINAL.** You may not appeal your own claim.

2 . If you lost the case and the court ordered you to pay money, your money and property may be taken to pay the claim unless you do one of the following things:

a. **PAY THE JUDGMENT**
The law requires you to pay the amount of the judgment. You may pay the judgment creditor directly, or pay the judgment to the court for an additional fee. You may also ask the court to order monthly payments you can afford. Ask the clerk for information about these procedures.

b. **APPEAL**
If you disagree with the court's decision, you may appeal the decision *on the other party's claim. You* may not appeal the decision on your own claim. However, if any party appeals, there will be a new trial on *all* the claims. If you appeared at the trial, you *must* begin your appeal by filing a form called a *Notice of Appeal* (form SC-140) and pay the required fees within 30 *days* after the date this *Notice of Entry of Judgment* was mailed or handed to you. Your appeal will be in the superior court. You will have a **new trial** and you must present your evidence again. You may be represented by a lawyer.

c. **VACATE OR CANCEL THE JUDGMENT**
If you did not go to the trial, you may ask the court to vacate or cancel the judgment. To make this request, you must file a *Motion to Vacate the Judgment* (form SC-135) and pay the required fee *within 30 days* after the date this *Notice of Entry of Judgment* was mailed. If your request is denied, you then have 10 *days* from the date the notice of denial was mailed to file an appeal. The period to file the *Motion to Vacate the Judgment is 180 days* if you were *not properly served* with the claim. The 180-day period begins on the date you found out or should have found out about the judgment against you.

IF YOU WON THE CASE . . .

1. If you were sued by the other party and you won the case, then the other party may not appeal the court's decision.
2. If you won the case and the court awarded you money, here are some steps you may take to collect your money or get possession of your property:

a. **COLLECTING FEES AND INTEREST**
Sometimes fees are charged for filing court papers or for serving the judgment debtor. These extra costs can become part of your original judgment. To claim these fees, ask the clerk for a *Memorandum of Costs.*

b. **VOLUNTARY PAYMENT**
Ask the judgment debtor to pay the money. If your claim was for possession of property, ask the judgment debtor to return the property to you. **THE COURT WILL NOT COLLECT THE MONEY OR ENFORCE THE JUDGMENT FOR YOU.**

c. **STATEMENT OF ASSETS**
If the judgment debtor does not pay the money, the law requires the debtor to fill out a form called the Judgment Debtor's Statement of Assets (form SC-133). This form will tell you what property the judgment debtor has that may be available to pay your claim. If the judgment debtor willfully fails to send you the completed form, you may file an *Application and Order to Produce Statement of Assets and to Appear for Examination* (form SC-134) and ask the court to give you your attorney's fees and expenses and other appropriate relief, after proper notice, under Code of Civil Procedure section 708.170.

d. **ORDER OF EXAMINATION**
You may also make the debtor come to court to answer questions about income and property. To do this, ask the clerk for an *Application and Order for Appearance and Examination (Enforcement of Judgment)* (form EJ-125) and pay the required fee. There is a fee if a law officer serves the order on the judgment debtor. You may also obtain the judgment debtors financial records. Ask the clerk for the *Small Claims Subpoena and Declaration* (form SC-107) or *Civil Subpoena Duces Tecum* (form SUBP-002).

e. **WRIT OF EXECUTION**
After you find out about the judgment debtor's property, you may ask the court for a *Writ of Execution* (form EJ-1 30) and pay the required fee. A writ of execution is a court paper that tells a law officer to take property of the judgment debtor to pay your claim. Here are some examples of the kinds of property the officer may be able to take: **wages, bank account, automobile, business property, or rental income.** For some kinds of property, you may need to file other forms. See the law officer for information.

f. **ABSTRACT OF JUDGMENT**
The judgment debtor may own land or a house or other buildings. You may want to put a lien on the property so that you will be paid if the property is sold. You can get a lien by filing an *Abstract of Judgment* (form EJ-001) with the county recorder in the county where the property is located. The recorder will charge a fee for the *Abstract of Judgment*

NOTICE TO THE PARTY WHO WON: As soon as you have been paid in full, you *must* fill out the form below and mail it to the court *immediately* or you may be fined. If an *Abstract of JUDGMENT* has been recorded, you must use another form; see the clerk for the proper form.

SMALL CLAIMS CASE NO.:21STSC04574

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SATISFACTION OF JUDGMENT

(Do not use this form if an Abstract of Judgment has been recorded.)

To the Clerk of the Court:
I am the [ ] judgment creditor [ ] assignee of record.
I agree that the JUDGMENT in this action has been paid in full or otherwise satisfied.

Date:

_____ ▶ _____

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (SIGNATURE)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Civil Division

Central District, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Department 90

19STSC14394
GEARY JOHNSON vs POWER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC., A CORPORATION, et al.

July 2, 2021
8:30 AM

Commissioner: Honorable Emma Castro
Judicial Assistant: S. Diaz
Courtroom Assistant: None

CSR: None
ERM: None
Deputy Sheriff: R Watts

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff(s): No Appearances

For Defendant(s): No Appearances

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: Ruling on Submitted Matter

The Court, having taken the matter under submission and after considering the testimonies of the Parties and all evidence presented during Trial, renders judgment as follows:

The Court orders POWER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC., A CORPORATION, KASSANDRA HARRIS, CYNTHIA REYNOSA and BRENT PARSONS in Plaintiff's Claim filed by Geary Johnson on 12/23/2019 dismissed without prejudice.

Court orders judgment entered on the Plaintiff's Claim filed by Geary Johnson on 12/23/2019 as follows: Defendants HI POINT APTS, LLC; WALTER BARRATT do not owe the plaintiff Geary Johnson any money on plaintiff's claim.

Court orders judgment entered on the Defendant's Claim filed by KASSANDRA HARRIS, et al. on 09/11/2020 as follows: Plaintiff Geary Johnson does not owe the defendants KASSANDRA HARRIS AKA KASSY HARRIS; CYNTHIA REYNOSA; BRENT PARSONS; POWER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC., A CORPORATION DBA POWER PROPERTY GROUP; HI POINT APTS, LLC; WALTER BARRATT any money on defendant's claim.

Certificate of Mailing is attached.

CENTRAL DISTRICT
Stanley Mosk Courthouse
111 North Hill Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

SMALL CLAIMS CASE NO: 19STSC14394

- NOTICE TO ALL PLAINTIFFS AND DEFENDANTS –

Your small claims case has been decided. If you lost the case, and the court ordered you to pay money, your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court. Read the back of this sheet for important information about your rights.

- AVISO A TODOS LOS DEMANDANTES Y DEMANDADOS –

Su caso ha sido resuelto por la corte para reclarnos judiciales menores. Si la corte ha decidido en su contra y ha ordenado que usted pague dinero, le pueden quitar su salario, su dinero, y otras cosas de su propiedad, sin aviso adicional por parte de esta corte. Lea el reverso de este formulario para obtener informacion de importancia acerca de sus derechos.

PLAINTIFF/DEMANDANTE
✓ Geary Johnson
1522 Hi Point Street Apt 9
Los Angeles, CA 90035

DEFENDANT/DEMANDADO
POWER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC., A CORPORATION
8885 VENICE BLVD STE 205
LOS ANGELES, CA 90034

HI POINT APTS, LLC
226 CARROLL CANAL
VENICE, CA 90291

KASSANDRA HARRIS
1522 HI POINT ST NO. 12
LOS ANGELES, CA 90035

CYNTHIA REYNOSA
8885 VENICE BLVD STE 205
LOS ANGELES, CA 90034

BRENT PARSONS
8885 VENICE BLVD STE 205
LOS ANGELES, CA 90034

WALTER BARRATT
226 CARROLL CANAL
VENICE, CA 90291

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

JUDGMENT WAS ENTERED AS STATED BELOW ON (DATE): 07/01/2021
Court orders judgment entered on the Plaintiff's Claim filed by Geary Johnson on 12/23/2019 as follows: Defendants HI POINT APTS, LLC; WALTER BARRATT do not owe the plaintiff Geary Johnson any money on plaintiff's claim.

JUDGMENT WAS ENTERED AS STATED BELOW ON (DATE): 07/01/2021
Court orders judgment entered on the Defendant's Claim filed by KASSANDRA HARRIS, et al. on 09/11/2020 as follows: Plaintiff Geary Johnson does not owe the defendants KASSANDRA HARRIS AKA KASSY HARRIS; CYNTHIA REYNOSA; BRENT PARSONS; POWER PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC., A CORPORATION DBA POWER PROPERTY GROUP; HI POINT APTS, LLC; WALTER BARRATT any money on defendant's claim.

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING - I certify that I am not a party to this action. This *Notice of Entry of Judgment* was mailed first class, postage prepaid, in a sealed envelope to the parties at the addresses shown above. The mailing and this certification occurred at the place and on the date shown below.

Place of mailing: Los Angeles CA 90012
Date of mailing: 07/6/2021

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

S. Diaz

Clerk by _____, **Deputy**

- The county provides small claims advisor services free of charge. Read the information sheet on the reverse.

INFORMATION AFTER JUDGMENT / *INFORMACION DESPUES DEL FALLO DE LA CORTE*

Your small claims case has been decided. The **judgment** or decision of the court appears on the front of this sheet. The court may have ordered one party to pay money to the other party. The person (or business) who won the case and who can collect the money is called the **judgment creditor.** The person (or business) who lost the case and who owes the money is called the **judgment debtor.**
Enforcement of the judgment is postponed until the time for appeal ends or until the appeal is decided. This means that the judgment creditor cannot collect any money or take any action until this period is over. Generally, both parties may be represented by lawyers after judgment.

IF YOU LOST THE CASE . . .

1. If you lost the case on your own claim and the court did not award you any money, the court's decision on your claim is **FINAL.** You may not appeal your own claim.
2. If you lost the case and the court ordered you to pay money, your money and property may be taken to pay the claim unless you do one of the following things:

a. **PAY THE JUDGMENT**
The law requires you to pay the amount of the judgment. You may pay the judgment creditor directly, or pay the judgment to the court for an additional fee. You may also ask the court to order monthly payments you can afford. Ask the clerk for information about these procedures.

b. **APPEAL**
If you disagree with the court's decision, you may appeal the decision *on the other party's claim. You* may not appeal the decision on your own claim. However, if any party appeals, there will be a new trial on *all* the claims. If you appeared at the trial, you *must* begin your appeal by filing a form called a *Notice of Appeal* (form SC-140) and pay the required fees within 30 *days* after the date this *Notice of Entry of Judgment* was mailed or handed to you. Your appeal will be in the superior court. You will have a **new trial** and you must present your evidence again. You may be represented by a lawyer.

c. **VACATE OR CANCEL THE JUDGMENT**
If you did not go to the trial, you may ask the court to vacate or cancel the judgment. To make this request, you must file a *Motion to Vacate the Judgment* (form SC-135) and pay the required fee *within 30 days* after the date this *Notice of Entry of Judgment* was mailed. If your request is denied, you then have 10 *days* from the date the notice of denial was mailed to file an appeal. The period to file the *Motion to Vacate the Judgment is 180 days* if you were *not properly served* with the claim. The 180-day period begins on the date you found out or should have found out about the judgment against you.

IF YOU WON THE CASE . . .

1. If you were sued by the other party and you won the case, then the other party may not appeal the court's decision.
2. If you won the case and the court awarded you money, here are some steps you may take to collect your money or get possession of your property:

a. **COLLECTING FEES AND INTEREST**
Sometimes fees are charged for filing court papers or for serving the judgment debtor. These extra costs can become part of your original judgment. To claim these fees, ask the clerk for a *Memorandum of Costs.*

b. **VOLUNTARY PAYMENT**
Ask the judgment debtor to pay the money. If your claim was for possession of property, ask the judgment debtor to return the property to you. **THE COURT WILL NOT COLLECT THE MONEY OR ENFORCE THE JUDGMENT FOR YOU.**

c. **STATEMENT OF ASSETS**
If the judgment debtor does not pay the money, the law requires the debtor to fill out a form called the Judgment Debtor's Statement of Assets (form SC-133). This form will tell you what property the judgment debtor has that may be available to pay your claim. If the judgment debtor willfully fails to send you the completed form, you may file an *Application and Order to Produce Statement of Assets and to Appear for Examination* (form SC-134) and ask the court to give you your attorney's fees and expenses and other appropriate relief, after proper notice, under Code of Civil Procedure section 708.170.

d. **ORDER OF EXAMINATION**
You may also make the debtor come to court to answer questions about income and property. To do this, ask the clerk for an *Application and Order for Appearance and Examination (Enforcement of Judgment)* (form EJ-125) and pay the required fee. There is a fee if a law officer serves the order on the judgment debtor. You may also obtain the judgment debtors financial records. Ask the clerk for the *Small Claims Subpoena and Declaration* (form SC-107) or *Civil Subpoena Duces Tecum* (form SUBP-002).

e. **WRIT OF EXECUTION**
After you find out about the judgment debtor's property, you may ask the court for a *Writ of Execution* (form EJ-1 30) and pay the required fee. A writ of execution is a court paper that tells a law officer to take property of the judgment debtor to pay your claim. Here are some examples of the kinds of property the officer may be able to take: **wages, bank account, automobile, business property, or rental income.** For some kinds of property, you may need to file other forms. See the law officer for information.

f. **ABSTRACT OF JUDGMENT**
The judgment debtor may own land or a house or other buildings. You may want to put a lien on the property so that you will be paid if the property is sold. You can get a lien by filing an *Abstract of Judgment* (form EJ-001) with the county recorder in the county where the property is located. The recorder will charge a fee for the *Abstract of Judgment*

NOTICE TO THE PARTY WHO WON: As soon as you have been paid in full, you *must* fill out the form below and mail it to the court *immediately* or you may be fined. If an *Abstract of JUDGMENT* has been recorded, you must use another form; see the clerk for the proper form.

SMALL CLAIMS CASE NO.:19STSC14394

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SATISFACTION OF JUDGMENT

(Do not use this form if an Abstract of Judgment has been recorded.)

To the Clerk of the Court:
I am the [ ] judgment creditor [ ] assignee of record.
I agree that the JUDGMENT in this action has been paid in full or otherwise satisfied.

Date:

_____ ▶ _____

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (SIGNATURE)

POWER PROPERTY Management

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. [redacted], 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. [redacted] 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. [redacted] 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. [redacted] 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. [redacted] 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,

Thomas Khammar
Managing Partner
Power Property Management

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THREE PREVIOUS CASES and the three victories in my favor

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

YOUR PARAGRAPH STARTING WITH NOT WITHSTANDING THE FACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fraud is exception to res judicata
Fraud, Deceit, and Misrepresentation
Fraud in a contract consists of the promisor giving apparent consent against his or her free will. Furthermore, a "promise made without any intention of performing it constitutes fraud" *Union Flower Mkt. v. S. Cal. Flower Mkt.* (1938) 10 Cal. 2d 671, 676

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

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

Continuing obligations is exception to res judicata.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All rights reserved to revise or modify this response.

/s/ Geary J. Johnson

1522 Hi Point St 9
Los Ángeles. CA. 90035

Sat Feb 14th, 2026 10:34 AM Pacific Time

FAX

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

TO:

Name: Hi Point 1522 LLC and Power Property Mgmt Inc

Fax Number: (310) 661-8195 # of Pages: 1
(including cover sheet)

FROM:

Name: Geary Juan Johnson

Fax Number: (323) 809-4119

Subject: Your communications

Message:

(Via fax and electronic email or otherwise). I have received your email dated Feb 12, 2026 at 12:30 pm. You make reference to your letter of February 11, 2026 posted in an envelope to our unit door. You state in your email "we will only be responding to new matters as the courts have already ruled against you over and over." This is untrue. This is also a contradiction to your Feb 11 letter in which you say, "if you would like to further discuss or have other suggested accommodations for the owner to consider, we remain as always available to discuss the same with you." The Feb 11 and Feb communications are not on the same page. Nevertheless, as stated in my rebuttal to your Feb 11, 2026 letter, none of your communications offer a different effective accommodation. To continue discussions, that is the first step that you provide the different effective accommodations. As regards your statement that courts have ruled against me, I have responded to that. The courts made two decisions in my favor in case 19STSC14394, and the court ruled in my favor in case 21STSC04574. Your statement is an actionable fraudulent representation. I also reminded you that the rental agreement says parking for two cars, as in number (#) of parking spaces is 2. The rent agreement does not say if stall 8 is single or tandem stall. The rent agreement gives the owner the right to change the parking assignments at any time, which is what I have been requesting for years---and the rent agreement does not authorize a new different agreement for parking nor does the rental agreement authorize any extra fee like $150 for parking. A different agreement for parking fees and fees are prohibited by the rent agreement. Last, continuing performance and continuing obligations, as in this case, are not subject to res judicata. As long as I live at the subject property, I will continue to address to the owner my need for housing services. My payment of rent constitutes new matters, and if you continue to deny requested housing services, it constitutes new matters.