

RESPONSE . Re: DIS0002519 - Discrimination Complaint filed against Hi Point 1522 LLC- Follow-Up

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

To: thomas.scott@lacity.org

Cc: 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; ramazanali.almasi@lacity.org; kevin.brown@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org; councilmember.martinez@lacity.org; rene.flores@lacity.org; alan.christensen@lacity.org; phillip.munguia@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 at 02:26 PM PDT

MR. SCOTT:

As regards City Los Angeles Case number DIS0002519 with the city Civil Rights Department.

1. I have reviewed your response below.
2. I verify that in summary my original complaint to you February 28, 2026, included five attachments. The brunt of the complaint was my doctor letters to the owner supporting my disabilities as a Black American and city resident, my requests for reasonable housing accommodation re indoor monitor and interface for the Akuvox system, my request for accessible parking, and my request for accessible unit door entry peephole.
3. I subsequently emailed you more documents on Feb 13, 2026.
3. In my March 10 email to you, which you replied to, I mentioned "I believe the requested handicapped parking stall and intercom are under the Building Code as "Accessibility" requirements, section 11B-708.4.2 for example requires indoor interface (monitor) to use the Akuvox. Owner has not supplied the monitor so I have no way to use Akuvox. Also see Building Code 11A Housing Accessibility and any code sections in effect when building was built."
4. So you have actual and constructive knowledge that the Akuvox requires a monitor indoor interface, is a legal "accessibility" requirement----and if you looked that up, the code requires audio and video into the tenant unit. I believe that code requirement arised in 2022 and the system here was installed in 2023.
5. In the photos I supplied by email, you can see the video capability because a person-----me can clearly be seen in the camera of the device.

6. Your response below is abuse of authority and abuse of discretion, because it ignores the building code requirements, ignores my request for reasonable indoor monitor, reasonable accessible parking and reasonable accessible unit wheelchair height peephole. **I do not have audio or video intercom connection in my apartment.**

7. The word "intercom" means there has to be a voice connection---and sometimes audio---from the common area front of the building and the tenant unit. Intercom in the building code is described as "two way communication."

8. The system is called Akuvox door entry intercom system, if you look at their website. I explain this because the door entry can be used separately, or the door entry can be used as part of the intercom function.

9. Mr. Thomas Khammar, who is the boss of Mr. Vasquez, has said repeatedly that the intercom function is working and that my roommate used it 27 times. Not true of course, but I am comparing that to what you said that Vasquez said. Vasquez is 2 months new to the property so maybe he does not know.

10. Barring the fact that there is a camera screen on the Akuvox, Mr. Vasquez may be correct and that would mean that Mr. Khammar is not telling the truth.

11. Your email seems to say that the intercom is being used for door entry. Not sure how you can use the intercom for door entry if there is no audio or visual to identity who is there; your email does not say that there is audio interaction. An intercom is audio communication, or audio and video.

12. I am forwarding this to the code violation department because the statement of Vasquez proves that the Akuvox system intercom does not comply with the city and building code which requires the system to have audio and visual interface or capability and to a connection inside the unit. Audio or visual, your email admits there is no connection from the front of the common area to any device inside the unit. This is problematic to myself and all tenants.

13. Add another layer is that yesterday, code violation inspector Alan Christenson said that the intercom function audio and visual is accessed by using an owner supplied cell phone; Alan did not actually test the system using his cell phone, but he identified that there is visual capability.

14. So who is telling the truth in this picture? You? Alan? Vasquez? Akuvox? Me?

15. Your letter does not indicate is there audio capability from the common area to tenants, only that the system does not work for the intercom. I remind you that a door entry code is not an intercom.

Your letter is not acceptable as an "investigation".

All rights reserved.

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

On Wednesday, March 11, 2026 at 11:44:02 AM PDT, LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com> wrote:

Good afternoon Mr. Geary Johnson,

This is Special Investigator Tom Scott with the Los Angeles Civil Rights Department, and I am reaching out to you to advise you that I have spoken with Mr. Brian Vasquez and this is what I have discovered. I asked Mr. Vasquez if Mr. Vasquez was familiar with the intercom system that is presently installed at the building where you are residing. Mr. Vasquez advised that he was. I asked Mr. Vasquez to explain the features of the intercom system and if there was a video/audio component to the system that was not properly functioning at this time. This is what was explained to me, the intercom is not set up for any kind of video/audio component for the tenants use in identifying who is currently at the entry doors. The intercom is basically set up as a way of accessing the building without having to use a key to enter the door. Each tenant is provided a PIN number for the door and once the PIN number is put into the system the door will automatically unlock allowing entry. I then asked if there were cameras set up at the entry points that would allow a tenant to be able to view who was attempting to enter the building. Mr. Vasquez advised that there are currently four (4) cameras at the location positioned at the main entrance, rear entrance, rear stairwell and laundry room. Those cameras are sync through an App that is for management and security only. No tenant has been granted access to this App. I then clarified with Mr. Vasquez that the current intercom system is basically a system that negates the need for a key to unlock the location door so that entry may be made inside the building, and that there is no ability of the system to present live video or photographs of subjects at the door to any of the tenants. Mr. Vasquez advised that is correct. I trust this is helpful to you Mr. Johnson. Thank you.

Regards,

Tom Scott, Special Investigator