

Communication from Public

Name: Geary Juan Johnson

Date Submitted: 05/26/2026 11:36 PM

Council File No: 26-1200-S19

Comments for Public Posting: 26-1200-S19 . COMMUNICATION FROM THE MAYOR relative to the appointment of Stewart Sebastian Lozano to the Board of El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument Authority Commissioners. THIS MATTER IS OPPOSED because the LOS ANGELES Mayor, Council and housing department act in a discriminatory, corrupt, and retaliatory manner against tenants who are Black, Latino, and Disabled. Owner agent Thomas Khammar (Hi Point 1522 LLC) is admitting that the accessible unit peephole, accessible or tandem parking stall, and accessible intercom and intercom monitor, are necessary housing services. I disagree, however, with his assertion that I have to pay for such services. UNIT PEEPHOLE. There is already a peephole at the unit door. That peephole was replaced on December 2025, I can supply the letter verifying that, and there was no additional charge or fee that the owner claimed. In addition, there is a slot for US Mail that has been unused for years and that slot could be used for the installation of a wheelchair accessible peephole. In addition, there's no provision in the rental agreement that I would have to pay for such unit peephole as Khammar alleges. As such an order for the PEEPHOLE to be replaced, Khammar would have to give me a reduction in rent which I would say \$300 would cover it. In particular, Khammar alleges in his March 13 letter that "the installation cost of the device are at your own expense. You will be responsible for direct payment to the vendor for all associated costs". There is no such provision in the rental agreement. ACCESSIBLE HANDICAPPED STALL. In addition, there's no provision in the rental agreement that I would have to pay for such parking stall as Khammar alleges. As such an order for tandem parking stall, Khammar would have to give me a reduction in rent which I would say \$150 per month would cover it since that is the fee he quotes. I note that in the recent past 2010-now, all parking is included in rent paid, so there is no extra fee or charge outside the rent agreement. I have checked with other tenants, and no one is paying for parking, single or tandem stall. At one time the owner in 2014 said in writing \$50 per month for tandem parking but I paid the \$50 and the stall was not supplied. In the rental agreement, there is no requirement that I pay for parking, even though the agreement says Parking Space and indicates "2" which could be interpreted as parking for two cars. Nevertheless, the rental agreement does not require me to make any type of payment or agreement to pay for an accessible handicap parking stall. The owner has not provided any proof that providing the handicap parking stall or tandem parking ---or any of my requests---would cause an undue financial burden. I previously from 2010 to 2014 was assigned to a tandem parking stall and there was no charge outside of the rent agreement. There's also no provision in the rent agreement that would allow the owner to charge for parking. THE INTERCOM. In addition, there's no provision in the rental agreement that I would have to pay for such intercom or indoor monitor or interface as Khammar alleges. The imposition of the fee by Khammar is harassment and illegal rent increase. If Khammar can figure out what the cost of the unit interface or monitor would be, perhaps \$100 for the unit plus monthly internet cost, then let Khammar (Hi Point 1522 LLC) has to give us \$100 per month rent reduction in order to pay for the indoor monitor or interface. The intercom installed in 1972 was not a separate cost to me. The intercom installed in 2014 did not require a separate cost from me. The intercom installed in 2023 does not show the owner charged me a fee to use it or asked me to pay for the missing parts (interface or indoor monitor) to use

it, until now. The owner is using federal and city tax resources and monies in committing fraud and discrimination. The government especially HUD, should not continue giving the property owner money to deny housing services and deny reasonable accommodations to me (and my roommate). 3-21-2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2025/25-0416_PC_PM_03-21-2026.pdf
4/9/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2015/15-0989-S65_pc_04-9-2026.pdf
4/28/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0512_PC_AM_04-28-2026.pdf
5/4/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0540_PC_PM_05-04-2026.pdf
5/10/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0005-S73_PC_PM_05-10-2026.pdf
5/17/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0511_PC_AM_05-17-2026.pdf

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.blumenfield@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



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. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
~~Thiphavong 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 [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], 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.

[REDACTED] mentions "your report of the present parking arrangement," but makes no
particular recommendation regarding same. While it is unclear what you "reported" to Dr.
Thiphavong, 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 [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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'TK' or similar initials, written in a cursive style.

Thomas Khammar
Managing Partner
Power Property Management

More Responses to Hi Point 1522 LLC re Thomas Khammar Position.

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; 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.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; jeffrey.bull@lacity.org; councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org

Cc: david@powerpropertygrp.com; vasquezbrian79@gmail.com; lahd.achp@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Sunday, February 15, 2026 at 11:58 AM PST

LAHD AcHP Grievance case no. GR26-723069

To whom it may concern:

Here are two more Feb 14 responses to Thomas Khammar on his position that denies me two way communication intercom and denies me tandem two car parking. These faxes were sent to him on February 14, 2026. They are forwarded by email to resident manager Brian Vasquez.

For the council persons, I add: is this acceptable in your district? PARKING. I have a single car stall used by myself and roommate. The rent agreement says parking for what number of cars: 2. The rent agreement says parking is included in the rent, there is no provision in the rental agreement to charge for parking. The owner claims the parking for the tandem parking is \$150 per month, up from \$50 per month, but I am not aware of any tenant that is paying \$150 per month. If the owner switches me from one car stall to two car stall, he suffers no financial hardship because he will still have the single stall available for other tenants. There are two other tandem stalls where single car tenant can be switched with myself. My photographic evidence also shows that tandem stalls 13-16 are not being used. INTERCOM: You can see from the response by Thomas Khammar (and code enforcement Steven Harrison) that there is no mention of the legal requirement by owner to install in the unit a indoor monitor interface for the intercom Akuvox system. **The interface indoor monitor is**

required by the Los Angeles Building Code. There is also no requirement in the rent agreement that I have to incur a cost of use my cell phone to access the Akuvox system. My question to councilpersons: is this the type of landlord conduct and harassment that is allowed in your district?

How does the owner propose I can use the intercom system? How does the owner propose I can be assigned a tandem two car parking stall? How does the owner propose I can access a handicapped parking stall? How does the owner propose I can receive a wheelchair height door unit peephole? The owner of the property has not offered any effective alternative accommodations.

This is copied to the complaint with the accessibility department.

All rights reserved.

Geary Juan Johnson

Phone 323-807-3099

On Friday, February 13, 2026 at 01:15:19 AM PST, G Johnson <tainmount@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

"Mayor Karen Bass and city council members says Black tenants are not entitled to intercom services and tandem parking"

Emailed to vasquezbrian79@gmail.com who acts for **Hi Point 1522 LLC**.

All rights reserved.

Geary Juan Johnson

1522 Hi Point St 9

Los Angeles. CA. 90035

Phone 323-807-3099

C:

vasquezbrian79@gmail.com

Resident manager at this address



2026-2-14 Fax PPM.pdf

746.9 kB



2026-2-14 HFax No 2 to PPM.pdf
49.9 kB



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 flourish.

Thomas Khammar

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 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.

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/-t8zwoNhhfY>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-t8zwoNhhfY>

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,



03/13/2026

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

Dear Geary Johnson,

We have received your request for a wheelchair-accessible peephole for your unit door, along with the supporting medical authorization from Kaiser Permanente.

We approve the installation of this device under the following conditions:

1. **Code Compliance:** The peephole must be installed at a height of no more than **43 inches** from the floor to ensure it meets **ADA and California Building Code (Title 24)** standards for wheelchair accessibility.
2. **Vendor:** You are authorized to use our approved vendor(s) to perform the installation to ensure the structural integrity of the door is maintained.
3. **Cost:** Please be advised that the installation and the cost of the device are **at your own expense**. You will be responsible for direct payment to the vendor for all associated costs.

Please contact Thomas via email at thomas@powerpropertygrp.com if you would like the contact information for our approved vendor to schedule the work.

Sincerely,

Thomas Khammar, Manager

Hi Point 1522 LLC c/o Power Property Management

FOLLOW US ONLINE:



New Response to March 13 letter from Thomas Khammar re accessible unit door peephole request. DIS0002519

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; 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 24, 2026 at 11:33 PM PDT

MARCH 24, 2026

GEARY J. JOHNSON
1522 HI POINT ST 9
LOS ANGELES. CA. 90035
323-807-3099

HI POINT 1522 LLC
RE 1522 HI POINT STREET 90035
VIA POWER PROPERTY MGMT GROUP

Dear OWNER:

BACKGROUND

A working intercom and unit interface (indoor monitor), handicapped parking stall, and wheelchair accessible unit peephole, are already requirements under the City building accessibility codes, therefore landlords must bear the cost.

I am writing in response to your MARCH 13, 2026 (attached) letter regarding the installation of a wheelchair-accessible peephole at my unit. While I appreciate your acknowledgment of my request, I must respectfully disagree with the assertion that I should bear the cost of this modification.

As per the City of Los Angeles's building accessibility codes, as well as the federal ADA and California's Title 24 regulations, certain accessibility features—including a wheelchair-accessible peephole—are mandatory for all residential units. These regulations specify that landlords are required to provide reasonable accommodations for tenants with disabilities, including the installation of features that allow for equal access and functionality.

Specifically, the request I submitted is a “reasonable accommodation” for a lowered peephole, necessary due to my disability, in accordance with the ADA (2009) and Title 24 (California Building Code), and peephole that allows me to see both ends of the hallway.

RELEVANT CONTEXT

1. Legal Precedent & Code Compliance:

- In 2014, you installed new peepholes for 15 out of the 18 units in this building, including installation of peepholes that allow residents to see both ends of the hallway. This installation was done at no additional cost to the tenants, and there was no assertion that this constituted a "significant repair."
- As a building receiving federal and state funding and subject to local rent control laws and building codes, all accommodations or modifications to meet accessibility codes are not only required but must be fulfilled by the landlord at their expense.
- In 2023 you installed a new door entry intercom system, but according to your own management, an interface connection was not made to each unit, as required by the building code accessibility standards.

2. Maintenance Responsibility:

- The installation of a wheelchair-accessible peephole should be treated as a maintenance obligation, as it is already required under both federal, state law, and local law. The costs associated with such modifications should be borne by the landlord, especially since these modifications are not new requests, but repairs or updates to ensure that the unit meets the necessary accessibility standards.
- There is no provision in the rental agreement requiring me to bear the costs of alterations for accessibility features. Additionally, there is no clause in the rental agreement that requires me to fund or cover the cost of the installation of an accessible peephole.
- Local rent control laws also do not require me to bear the cost of accessibility requirements.

3. Cost and Practical Considerations:

- As the existing peephole already has an opening in the door, and there is an unused mailbox slot opening, I would assume that this modification would incur minimal costs compared to other door modifications. This further reduces the financial

burden on the owner.

- Expanding the existing peephole to meet ADA accessibility standards involves adding a second, lower peephole or a wide-angle viewer at the required height (42-43 inches), a modification that should not pose undue hardship to the property owner.

4. Lack of Alternative Accommodation:

- The March 13 letter provided by the property owner does not offer an effective alternative accommodation to address my disability-related needs. ADA compliance requires that the tenant be provided with the necessary means of security, such as a handicapped assessable usable peephole. The proposed solution should be an effective and reasonable accommodation, not merely a suggestion of an optional alternative.

Legal Precedents & Case Law:

- According to the Fair Housing Act (FHA) and ADA, it is well-established that if a requested modification is necessary to allow a disabled tenant to enjoy their dwelling fully, the landlord is responsible for the costs associated with such a modification.
- The landlord is also responsible for maintaining accessibility features, such as working intercoms, handicapped parking, and accessible door peepholes. The financial burden of these maintenance obligations cannot be shifted to the tenant.

CONCLUSION

Given that the installation of an accessible peephole is not a discretionary request but rather a legal requirement under both ADA and Title 24, and local building codes, I ask that you reconsider the decision to require me to cover the costs of this installation.

I would appreciate it if you could provide a legal justification for why I should bear these costs, particularly in light of the mandatory building code requirements and the lack of any provisions in the rental agreement or RSO LAMC regulations that would require me to do so.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your prompt resolution of this issue in accordance with the law. All rights reserved.

Sincerely,

pastedGraphic.png

Geary J. Johnson

tainmount@sbcglobal.net

Reference: Hi Point 1522 Managers LLC

attachments 1 fax includes 2 letters



2026-3-24 Fax Reply to PPM re March 13.pdf
450.7 kB

NOTES MAY 26, 2026

Feb 11 2026 email from Thomas Khammar, agent for property owner.

March 9, 2026 email from Thomas Khammar.

March 13, 2026 email from Thomas Khammar.

My Responses

Owner agent Thomas Khammar is admitting that the accessible unit peephole, accessible or tandem parking stall, and accessible intercom and intercom monitor, are necessary housing services. I disagree, however, with his assertion that I have to pay for such services.

UNIT PEEPHOLE

There is already a peephole at the unit door. That peephole was replaced on December 2025, I can supply the letter verifying that, and there was no additional charge or fee that the owner claimed. In addition, there is a slot for US Mail that has been unused for years and that slot could be used for the installation of a wheelchair accessible peephole. In addition, there's no provision in the rental agreement that I would have to pay for such unit peephole as Khammar alleges. As such an order for the PEEPHOLE to be replaced, Khammar would have to give me a

reduction in rent which I would say \$300 would cover it. The only provision in the rent agreement is that I have to pay for repairs in which something was broken and was my fault so therefore that does not apply here. In particular, Khammar alleges in his March 13 letter that "the installation cost of the device are at your own expense. You will be responsible for direct payment to the vendor for all associated costs". Since there is no related discussion of this in my rental agreement, the March 13, 2026 position of Khammar constitutes illegal harassment and illegal rent increase.

ACCESSIBLE HANDICAPPED STALL

In addition, there's no provision in the rental agreement that I would have to pay for such parking stall as Khammar alleges. As such an order for tandem parking stall, Khammar would have to give me a reduction in rent which I would say \$150 per month would cover it since that is the fee he quotes. I note that in the recent past 2010-now, all parking is included in rent paid, so there is no extra fee or charge outside the rent agreement. I have checked with other tenants, and no one is paying for parking, single or tandem stall. At one time the owner in 2014 said in writing \$50 per month for tandem parking but I paid the \$50 and the stall was not supplied. In the rental agreement, there is no requirement that I pay for parking, even though the agreement says Parking Space and indicates "2" which could be interpreted as parking for two cars. Nevertheless, the rental agreement does not require me to make any type of payment or agreement to pay for an accessible handicap parking stall. The owner has not provided any proof that providing the handicap parking stall or tandem parking ---or any of my requests---would cause an undue financial burden. I previously from 2010 to 2014 was assigned to a tandem parking stall and there was no charge outside of the rent agreement. There's also no provision in the rent agreement that would allow the owner to charge for parking.

THE INTERCOM

In addition, there's no provision in the rental agreement that I would have to pay for such intercom or indoor monitor or interface as Khammar alleges. The imposition of the fee by Khammar is harassment and illegal rent increase. If Khammar can figure out what the cost of

the unit interface or monitor would be, perhaps \$100 for the unit plus monthly internet cost, then let Khammar (Hi Point 1522 LLC) has to give us \$100 per month rent reduction in order to pay for the indoor monitor or interface. The intercom installed in 1972 was not a separate cost to me. The intercom installed in 2014 did not require a separate cost from me. The intercom installed in 2023 does not show the owner charged me a fee to use it or asked me to pay for the missing parts (interface or indoor monitor) to use it, until now.

I do note that all of these reasonable housing service requests are spelled out also in various building codes, such as the city of Los Angeles building code, which describes the accessible wheelchair peephole height , handicapped parking stall, and Intercom system as accessibility requirements.

The owner can easily switch my parking stall, and repaint the lines or numbering, with none or minimal cost involved. My rental agreement pays for the cost of repairs, and all three services requested are repair issues.

The owner is using federal and city tax resources and monies and committing fraud and discrimination. The government especially HUD, should not continue giving the property owner money to deny housing services and deny reasonable accommodations to myself (and roommate).

The owner receives in rents about \$37,000 per month from this building. His property taxes are about \$12,000 per month on this property. Net profit about \$25,000 per month x 12 months = \$300,000 per year.

Recent Published to Agenda Published Comments City of Los Angeles

3-21-2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2025/25-0416_PC_PM_03-21-2026.pdf

4/9/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2015/15-0989-S65_pc_04-9-2026.pdf

4/28/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0512_PC_AM_04-28-2026.pdf

5/4/2026

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

5/10/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0005-S73_PC_PM_05-10-2026.pdf

5/17/2026

https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2026/26-0511_PC_AM_05-17-2026.pdf