
Re: July 5 2026. REVISION ON CASE CLOSURE .UPDATE REQUEST FOR FEDERAL INTERVENTION. TODAY'S HOUSING REQUESTS.

From: G Johnson (tainmount@sbcglobal.net)

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

Cc: lamayornews@lacity.org; ladbs.ahs@lacity.org; foia@hud.gov; congressionalaffairs@hudoig.gov; son.vuong@lacity.org; raul.vasquez@lacity.org

Bcc: hairylegs27@gmail.com

Date: Sunday, July 5, 2026 at 10:50 AM PDT

That amounts to denial of due process as well as government, corruption, and misuse of federal funds. That should be public information since this business entity deals with the public. Nevertheless, I was not given information to rebut the position of the property owner Hi Point 1522 LLC. In that way I was denied administrative due process by a city government agency receiving federal funds.

"no privilege may be claimed under this paragraph if any person authorized to do so has consented that the information be disclosed in the proceeding"

I HEREBY CONSENT THAT THIS INFORMATION BE DISCLOSED.

I HEREBY CONSENT THAT THE CASE INFORMATION BE DISCLOSED. Cases DIS0002519, DISINV0001225.

I note that the case closure letter of Thomas Scott says "issues related to parking, the building intercom system, and access to your unit." I do not believe "access" to the unit was a part of the complaint I submitted, so that would be an incorrect statement by the City.

July 5 2026

(Revised from July 4 2026 email)

CAPRI MADDOX

GENERAL MANAGER

CLAUDIA LUNA

ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA

CIVIL + HUMAN RIGHTS

AND EQUITY DEPARTMENT

201 N. LOS ANGELES ST., SUITE 6

LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

(213) 978-1845

civilandhumanrights.lacity.org

(VIA EMAIL)

Re

DIS0002519

DISINV0001225

To whom it may concern:

This communication is a revision on the following grounds:

1. The phrase by me is corrected as underlined If this case is about the denial of housing services concerning handicap parking stall, accessible unit intercom interface, and wheelchair height accessible unit door viewer, then in terms of medical condition I was not questioned about any of that from the so-called interviewer of the city government.
2. The notice of case closure names the complaint as against Power Property Management Inc. ("PPM") . PPM is not the owner of the property, but the designated owner. The original complaint to the city department names Hi Point 1522 LLC.
3. I have asked the Thomas Scott to explain why there are two case numbers DIS0002519 and DISINV0001225.
4. The civil rights department and the Mayor Karen Bass have engaged in a corrupt, secretive, back door deal with the landlord and HUD, as regards the case closure decision.
5. The mention of "medical condition" was the subject of a previous court case against the City government; the mention of my "medical condition" has been the subject of numerous city agenda City of Los Angeles postings. My medical condition is public information.
6. I request that the General Manager Capri Maddox reconsider the matter and reconvene and hold a public hearing on the matter and allow me full and impartial hearing and access to all information and witnesses, such information previously denied by the city government of this matter.
7. The information I have requested to be released is in the public interest because much of it has already been released to the Public, and by the City clerk office.
8. The evidence code states: "1040. (a) As used in this section, "official information" means information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, to the public prior to the time the claim of privilege is made." Your decision of case closure is vague and lacking in specificity in that it does not specify which "information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, to the public prior to the time the claim of privilege is made; much of the information forwarded to you by me had already been made public before the complaint was filed with your department. The City needs to break down each document by title, and each witness/party by title, and indicate has that information or person previously

been the subject of a city public record.

9. I remind the city of the issues before the department. I note also these are legally required by the city building code as "accessibility" building mandates. (1) Accessible wheelchair height unit door viewer, (2) accessible unit intercom interface or monitor, (3) accessible handicapped parking stall. It is also an issue before you as seen in Public Documents that the owner has tried to charge me a fee or charge for providing reasonable accommodations, such fee is prohibited by HUD and FHA regulations. I do not see any of this discussion in your notice of case closure.

10. Your decision effectively denies me these housing services. Your decision effectively does not comply with the city duty to supply accessible housing services. Your decision effectively does not comply with your duty not to engage in discrimination because of my disability.

11. Your department process and decision is discrimination against me because I am a Black male, with a disability and medical condition who has opposed unlawful discrimination practices by the City government of Los Angeles, including but not limited to complaints to the Housing Department and code enforcement departments.

12. I have been denied fair and impartial treatment.

[ORIGINAL TEXT July 4 2026]

The city government letter of May 22 closing this case matter and the refusal of the city government to release copies of the file documents, is not acceptable as a resolution to the matter at hand.

Your letter closing the case and your letter refusing to release copies of the case, is vague and lacking specificity, and does not comply with the applicable laws.

In order to claim privilege, you have to specifically list each document by name and date and author, and then you also have to state which part of the law you are applying to your refusal to release the copies. It appears you have indicated that there are numerous city employees, whether, local state or federal and you also implicate the city housing department as well as HUD and section 8 employees and officials. Numerous documents that were turned over to you by myself as the author are not subject to privilege because they had already been claimed as public document released to the public by the city clerks office, therefore they are not entitled to privilege or to confidentiality. Some of the documents released to you may have also been released in previous as you mentioned court cases with the city attorneys office release those documents or mention of them to the public.

Unlawful discrimination is in the public interest, and you have not given any grounds why any part of this case file should not be released to the public. You also have refused to release the documents and redact the portion you feel are subject to privilege or privacy, and release all other parts or documents that are not subject to privilege or privacy. You like to mention very

quickly litigation and you should know because you've been sued at least twice by myself for housing discrimination and you've also been sued by other parties for housing discrimination so the city is not interested in saving taxpayers money by solving housing problems, the city's only purpose is to continue to use taxpayers money to deny housing services to Blacks and Latinos, a pattern and practice that is evidenced by the numerous lawsuits of that nature against the city government and against Mayor Karen Bass. Many of the persons that you allude to in your complaint closure have already been named in numerous city council agenda items, and also named in exhibits filed by city government employees. If, for example, the HUD and section 8 are mentioned in this complaint, that information is already public information on the Internet, so it's not entitled to privacy or confidentiality. The owner of the property in question is supposedly serving the public and yet if the public questions any type of activity that they feel is wrongful of this property owner that you provide government assistance, the government is gonna shelve that complaint and claim confidentiality and privacy. This is just another sham job on the part of the city government.

This complaint process stems from the fact that the investigator on behalf of Mayor Karen Bass, did not engage in the McDonnell Douglas requirements for discrimination cases. Basically McDonnell Douglas requires that the complaint is filed, the respondent is questioned and then the claimant is allowed to review and respond to the position of the respondent. None of that happened in this case. There were no questions posed to me as to my medical condition, and there were no evidence given to me that the respondent had given a legitimate business reason for their actions. If this case is about the denial of housing services concerning handicap parking stall, accessible unit intercom interface, and wheelchair height accessible unit door viewer, then in terms of medical condition I was not questioned about any of that from the so-called interviewer of the city government. That amount to denial of due process as well as government, corruption, and misuse of federal funds. That should be public information since this business entity deals with the public. Nevertheless, I was not given information to rebut the position of the property owner Hi Point 1522 LLC. In that way I was denied administrative due process by a city government agency receiving federal funds.

You claim in your letter of closure: " As part of the Department's review and investigation into the allegations, the assigned investigator reviewed the information and correspondence you provided, communicated with Power Property Management, conducted interviews, reviewed relevant correspondence from management, and reviewed the documentation related to the Los Angeles Housing Department's site visit of the complaint address to better understand the concerns raised." So that is seemingly a lot that occurred, but I am not given the privilege of questioning it. You claim you communicated with Power Property Management, but you did not share that information with me; you claim you conducted interviews, but you did not share that information with me; you claim your reviewed relevant documentation related to the Los Angeles housing department site visit, but you did not share that information with me. So in other words, you did not enable me to engage in a rebuttal or response to the information from all of those parties that you claimed to have interviewed. That denies me due process. If this matter did go to court, the court would most likely order you to provide all that information to the court, and to me, and then that whole process would be questioned by the court to examine why due process was denied to me. Obviously it was denied to me for purposes up racial discrimination, disability discrimination, and medical condition discrimination. You claim that you did not find any evidence of medical condition discrimination, yet yet it does not appear that you questioned me as to what my medical condition was or how that information was communicated to the Property owner. You also did establish what disability information was communicated to you and why you separated the disability information from the medical condition information being that disability comes from a medical condition. See if you knew you weren't going to investigate medical condition information in the first place because you feel you didn't have jurisdiction over disability, then why did you supposedly engage in so much interviewing and reviewing documents when you knew from the beginning that you didn't have jurisdiction? That does seem to be a mystery. Now you want to claim privilege over documents

regarding disability and at the same time claim that you had no jurisdiction to investigate disability in the first place, so that's the reason why you're trying to claim privilege over documents which are related to something that you claim you had no jurisdiction over. That makes utterly no sense. You claim you had no jurisdiction to investigate a disability claim, you claimed there was no evidence of a medical condition claim, so therefore you cannot claim privilege or privacy of information that was related to something that you claim you had no jurisdiction over. Please release the copy of the files as I have requested and for any portions that you feel are entitled to privilege or privacy please redact those portions and explain each reduction that you have made with the alleged government authority; please do sell with each document in your possession or each interview in your possession or any other information that is tangible to figure out whether it should be redacted or not. If you have names of people you interviewed and they are government officials, they are not entitled to privacy or redaction of their names.

1. Plaintiff's Prima Facie case
2. Employer's Legitimate, Nondiscriminatory Reason
3. 3. Plaintiff's Proof of Pretext

If the employer provides a valid justification, the burden shifts back to the plaintiff. To win, the employee must prove that the employer's stated reason is false—in other words, that it is a pretext for discrimination. The employee can establish this by showing the employer's explanation lacks factual backing, violates company policies, or that the real motivation was inherently discriminatory.

My prime facing case was established by the filing of the complaint and by your investigation of the complaint. You accepted that my complaint was about medical condition discrimination.

The housing provider definitely had information about my medical condition, but that would've been based on my ailments and disabilities. Even if the housing provider did not have direct information of my medical ailment or condition, they certainly would have inferred it from the information on my disability. This is clear cut. The medical condition cannot be separated from the disability. What is the housing providers non-discriminatory reason for their denial of housing services? Probably the most prominent reason they have given is because I refuse to pay for the requested reasonable housing accommodations. As your department should know that reason and itself is discriminatory. Trying to charge someone for any of the housing services I'm requesting is considered to be discrimination. There is no legitimate reason that the housing provider can claim that he can claim that he is not a discriminating against me. The discrimination is in his actions repeatedly over and over and over again. The property owner, as told to your department, takes in over \$37,000 a month in rents and that is public information. He is not suffering a financial burden.

The motivation of the housing provider is inherently discriminatory. That evidence has been given to the city of Los Angeles, civil rights and equity department. The city government is intent on ignoring that evidence. Whether it is medical condition discrimination, or whether it is disability discrimination, the property owner has not mounted a legitimate business reason for their denial of reasonable housing accommodations. If the city government has evidence of an legitimate business reason, then let the city government release that information to the public. Not just the conclusions, release the evidence.

The city government refusal to participate in the McDonnell Douglas, balancing provision, and refusal to allow me to respond to or rebut the position of the property owner, amounts to government racial and disability discrimination that the public needs to know about.

“Yes, courts routinely use the McDonnell Douglas burden-shifting framework in medical condition and disability discrimination cases, such as those brought under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or state equivalents like California’s FEHA.”

“This email is in response to your request for records regarding the above-referenced matter. Please be advised that this record is exempt from disclosure under the official information privilege, pursuant to Government Code Section 7927.705 and Evidence Code Section 1040. Additionally, it is exempt under Government Code Section 7922.000, as the public interest in maintaining the confidentiality of complaints and investigations outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Furthermore, department policy dictates that complaints and investigations remain confidential until a Notice of Violation is filed, at which point certain information becomes public (Los Angeles Municipal Code, § 51.05). July 1, 2026. Public Records Request, Case No. DISINV0001225.”

My research

ARTICLE 1. Justification for Withholding of Record [7922.000- 7922.000.] (Article 1 added by Stats. 2021, Ch. 614, Sec. 2.)

7922.000.

An agency shall justify withholding any record by demonstrating that the record in question is exempt under express provisions of this division, or that on the facts of the particular case the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record.

Evidence code

1040. (a) As used in this section, “official information” means information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of his or her duty and not open, or officially disclosed, to the public prior to the time the claim of privilege is made.

(b) A public entity has a privilege to refuse to disclose official information, and to prevent another from disclosing official information, if the privilege is claimed by a person authorized by the public entity to do so and either of the following apply:

(1) Disclosure is forbidden by an act of the Congress of the United States or a statute of this state.

(2) Disclosure of the information is against the public interest because there is a necessity for preserving the confidentiality of the information that outweighs the necessity for disclosure in the interest of justice; but no privilege may be claimed under this paragraph if any person authorized to do so has consented that the information be disclosed in the proceeding. In determining whether disclosure of the information is against the public interest, the interest of the public entity as a party in the outcome of the proceeding may not be considered.

(c) Notwithstanding any other law, the Employment Development Department shall disclose to law enforcement agencies, in accordance with subdivision (i) of Section 1095 of the Unemployment Insurance Code, information in its possession relating to any person if an arrest warrant has been issued for the person for commission of a felony.

(Amended by Stats. 2015, Ch. 20, Sec. 1. (SB 79) Effective June 24, 2015.)

CHAPTER 13. Private Records, Privileged Materials, and Other Records Protected by Law From Disclosure [7927.700 - 7927.710] (Chapter 13 added by Stats. 2021, Ch. 614, Sec. 2.)

7927.705.

Except as provided in Sections 7924.510, 7924.700, and 7929.610, this division does not require disclosure of records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.

SEC. 51.05. ENFORCEMENT.

(Amended by Ord. No. 187,032, Eff. 6/14/21.)

A. Reporting Violations. Any person whose rights, granted or protected by this article, have been violated, even if that person's only injury is the deprivation of that right granted or protected without physical or monetary damages, may report a complaint to the General Manager. The General Manager shall encourage reporting pursuant to this article by keeping confidential, to the extent permitted by law, the name and other identifying information of the Complainant. With the authorization of the Complainant, the General Manager may disclose the Complainant's name and identifying information as necessary to conduct investigations under this article or for other appropriate purposes. The General Manager shall disclose the name and identifying information of the Complainant at the time the General Manager issues a notice of violation to the Respondent.

B. Investigation. The General Manager shall be responsible for investigating violations of this article. A Respondent shall cooperate fully in any investigation by the General Manager. The General Manager shall have access to the Respondent's business sites, housing locations, and places of labor subject to this ordinance during business hours to inspect books and records, and to interview any relevant witnesses. Respondents shall provide the General Manager with their legal name, address, and telephone number in writing. The General Manager may request the Commission to subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance and testimony, and require by subpoena the production of any books, papers, records or other items relevant to inquiries, investigations, and enforcement actions under this article.

C. Settlement. The General Manager shall have the authority, at any time, to enter into a settlement agreement with a Respondent. The General Manager shall present any settlement agreement to the Commission for approval, which shall have the authority only to approve or disapprove the agreement. A settlement disapproved by the Commission shall be remanded to the General Manager, who shall resume enforcement authority over the matter, including the authority to present a new settlement to the Commission.

D. Determination. Whenever the General Manager finds that a violation of Section 51.03 or Section 51.04 has occurred, the General Manager shall publicly issue a notice of violation, which shall, in addition to describing the violation, impose administrative penalties, Compensatory Penalties, if any, and corrective actions, if any, consistent with Section 51.07. The General Manager shall serve the notice of violation, by First Class mail, on the respective Complainant and Respondent. The date of service shall be the date of the postmark on the mailing.

CAPRI MADDOX
GENERAL MANAGER
CLAUDIA LUNA
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA
CIVIL + HUMAN RIGHTS
AND EQUITY DEPARTMENT
201 N. LOS ANGELES ST., SUITE 6
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
(213) 978-1845
civilandhumanrights.lacity.org

KAREN BASS
MAYOR

The Housing Services Requested are Needed Today

References

CBC and Los Angeles Building Code sections. CBC 11A and 11B. CBC section 1102A.3.CBC section 11B-202.

Herein as told to city of los Angeles government employees: Alan Christensen, Mark E. Bridge, Vatche Kasumyan, Germain Mendoza, Steven Harrison, Councilmember Hernandez, Councilmember Nazarian, Bob Blumenfield, Councilmember Yaroslavsky, Councilmember Rodriguez, Councilmember Price, Councilmember Park, Councilmember Lee, Councilmember Jurado, Councilmember McOsker, Controller Mejia, Aram Avedisian, Eric Bane, Doran Bobadilla, Laura Zimmerman, Grant Woods, Sewada Zadoorian, Jason Wilson, Kelly Warner, Mark Wang, Fabian Gonzalez, Ramazanali Almasi, Kevin Brown, Councilmember Harris-Dawson, Councilmember Martinez, Rene Flores, Phillip Munguia. Mayor Karen Bass, Los Angeles City Council members

Eunisses Hernandez, Adrin Nazarian, Bob Blumenfield,
Nithya Raman, Katy Yaroslavsky, Imelda Padilla, Monica

Rodriquez, Marqueece Harris-Dawson, Curren Price,Jr.,

Heather Hutt, Traci Park, John Lee, Hugo Soto-Martinez,

Ysabel Jurado, Tim McOsker, Paul Krekorian

Power Property Management Group staff includes: Brent

Parsons, Thomas Khammar, Jackie Gallardo, Jeanette Conway,

Alva Corodo, Fidel Medina, Joel Murrillo, Javier Guevarra, Liliano

Morales, Edi Hernandez, Justice Walker, Brian Vasquez

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. (Source: Secretary of State Business Entities)

All rights reserved.

Geary Juan Johnson

1522 Hi Point St 9

Los Angeles. CA. 90035

Phone 323-807-3099

**This information may appear
under City NextRequest 26-
12238.**

Enclosure

Letter of case closure by city employee Thomas Scott MAY 22 2026



2026-5-22 letter of closure DIS Scott.pdf

134.8 kB