N1 6lr2078

By: Senator Hughes

Introduced and read first time: February 3, 2006

Assigned to: Judicial Proceedings

A BILL ENTITLED

1	AN ACT concerning
2	Real Property - Retaliatory Actions by Landlords and Mobile Home Park Owners
4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	providing that a tenant or resident has a certain burden of proof; establishing a certain presumption; authorizing a tenant or resident to take certain actions under certain circumstances; authorizing a court to invalidate certain retaliatory actions; providing that this Act supersedes certain local ordinances; defining certain terms; repealing certain provisions of law relating to retaliatory actions; and generally relating to retaliatory actions by landlords and mobile
.9 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Section 8-206, 8-208.1, and 8-208.2; and 8A-1301 and the subtitle "Subtitle 13. Retaliatory Evictions" Annotated Code of Maryland (2003 Replacement Volume and 2005 Supplement) BY adding to Article - Real Property Section 8-206; and 8A-1301 to be under the new subtitle "Subtitle 13. Retaliatory Actions"
28 29	·

30 SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 31 MARYLAND, That Section(s) 8-206, 8-208.1, and 8-208.2; and 8A-1301 and the

28

32

(7)

(8)

UNOFFICIAL COPY OF SENATE BILL 599 1 subtitle "Subtitle 13. Retaliatory Evictions" of Article - Real Property of the 2 Annotated Code of Maryland be repealed. SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That the Laws of Maryland 3 4 read as follows: 5 **Article - Real Property** 6 8-206. 7 (A) IN THIS SECTION, "RETALIATORY ACTION" INCLUDES: (1) INCREASING THE RENT OR IMPOSING OTHER OBLIGATIONS ON A 9 TENANT; (2) DECREASING SERVICES OR FAILING TO COMPLY WITH OTHER 11 OBLIGATIONS OF A LANDLORD; BRINGING OR THREATENING TO BRING AN ACTION FOR POSSESSION 12 (3) 13 AGAINST A TENANT: REFUSING TO RENEW A TENANT'S LEASE; OR 14 (4) (5)VIOLATING A TENANT'S PRIVACY, HARASSING A TENANT, OR USING 16 ANY OTHER FORM OF THREAT OR COERCION AGAINST A TENANT. 17 (B) A TENANT IS PROTECTED AGAINST RETALIATORY ACTION BY THE 18 LANDLORD IF: 19 (1) THE TENANT MADE A GOOD FAITH COMPLAINT TO THE LANDLORD; THE TENANT MADE A GOOD FAITH COMPLAINT TO A GOVERNMENT 20 21 AGENCY AGAINST THE LANDLORD; THE LANDLORD RECEIVED A NOTICE OF VIOLATION FROM A 23 GOVERNMENT AGENCY THAT AFFECTED THE PROPERTY RENTED BY THE TENANT; THE TENANT COMMUNICATED IN GOOD FAITH WITH PUBLIC MEDIA 25 OR PUBLIC OFFICIALS; THE TENANT OR A GOVERNMENT AGENCY PROVIDED INFORMATION 26 (5) 27 TO THE LANDLORD UNDER TITLE 6, SUBTITLE 8 OF THE ENVIRONMENT ARTICLE;

THE TENANT CONSULTED WITH A LAWYER OR FILED OR

THE TENANT FILED OR PARTICIPATED IN A RENT ESCROW ACTION

THE TENANT ORGANIZED, WAS A MEMBER OF, OR PARTICIPATED IN

29 PARTICIPATED IN A LAWSUIT AGAINST THE LANDLORD;

33 A TENANTS' ORGANIZATION OR ANY OTHER LAWFUL ORGANIZATION; OR

31 UNDER § 8-211 OR § 8-211.1 OF THIS SUBTITLE;

UNOFFICIAL COPY OF SENATE BILL 599

1 (9) THE TENANT DID NOT CONSENT TO: THE LANDLORD'S PROPOSAL OF A MIDTERM AMENDMENT OF 2 (I) 3 THE LEASE; OR THE LANDLORD'S PROPOSAL OF A REGULATION OR RULE (II) 5 ADOPTED AFTER THE TENANT ENTERED INTO THE LEASE THAT EFFECTS A 6 SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION OF THE LEASE. A LANDLORD MAY NOT TAKE RETALIATORY ACTION AGAINST A TENANT 7 (C) 8 BECAUSE THE TENANT ENGAGED IN ONE OR MORE PROTECTED ACTIVITIES 9 DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION (B) OF THIS SECTION. 10 (D) (1) THE TENANT HAS THE BURDEN OF PROVING THAT A MATERIAL 11 PURPOSE OF THE LANDLORD'S ACTION WAS TO RETALIATE AGAINST THE TENANT 12 BECAUSE OF THE TENANT'S PROTECTED ACTIVITY. 13 RETALIATION IS A QUESTION OF FACT TO BE DETERMINED BY A 14 PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE, CONSIDERING ALL RELEVANT FACTS AND 15 CIRCUMSTANCES. EVIDENCE THAT THE TENANT ENGAGED IN A PROTECTED ACTIVITY 16 (E) (1) 17 WITHIN 1 YEAR BEFORE THE ALLEGED RETALIATORY ACTION CREATES A 18 PRESUMPTION THAT THE LANDLORD'S CONDUCT WAS IN VIOLATION OF SUBSECTION 19 (C) OF THIS SECTION. 20 (2) THE PRESUMPTION DOES NOT ARISE IF: 21 (I) THE TENANT IS IN DEFAULT IN RENT; 22 THE TENANT ENGAGED IN THE PROTECTED ACTIVITY AFTER (II)23 LEGAL NOTICE OF A PROPOSED RENT INCREASE, LEASE TERMINATION, OR A LAWFUL 24 DIMINUTION OF SERVICES; OR THE VIOLATION OF THE APPLICABLE BUILDING OR HOUSING (III) 26 CODE COMPLAINED OF BY THE TENANT WAS CAUSED PRIMARILY BY LACK OF 27 REASONABLE CARE BY THE TENANT, A MEMBER OF THE TENANT'S FAMILY, OR 28 OTHER PERSON ON THE PREMISES WITH THE TENANT'S CONSENT. THE PRESUMPTION IS REBUTTED IF THE LANDLORD 29 (I) 30 INTRODUCES EVIDENCE OF A GENUINE, NONRETALIATORY REASON FOR THE 31 LANDLORD'S ACTION. 32 (II)IF THE TRIER OF FACT DETERMINES THAT THE PRESUMPTION 33 IS REBUTTED, THEN THE TRIER OF FACT SHALL DETERMINE WHETHER THE TENANT 34 HAS ESTABLISHED BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE LANDLORD'S 35 CONDUCT WAS IN VIOLATION OF SUBSECTION (C) OF THIS SECTION, WITHOUT 36 REGARD TO THE PRESUMPTION.

31

32 MEDIA OR PUBLIC OFFICIALS;

UNOFFICIAL COPY OF SENATE BILL 599

(F) IF THE LANDLORD ACTS IN VIOLATION OF SUBSECTION (C) OF THIS (1) 2 SECTION, THE TENANT: MAY BRING AN ACTION OR COUNTERCLAIM AGAINST THE 4 LANDLORD FOR DAMAGES AND ATTORNEY FEES; AND HAS A DEFENSE IN ANY ACTION FOR POSSESSION BROUGHT BY (II)6 THE LANDLORD AGAINST THE TENANT. THE COURT MAY INVALIDATE ANY ACTION FOUND TO BE A (2) 8 RETALIATORY ACTION. THIS SECTION SUPERSEDES ANY ORDINANCE ENACTED BY A COUNTY 10 THAT IS COMPARABLE IN SUBJECT MATTER. 11 SUBTITLE 13. RETALIATORY ACTIONS. 12 8A-1301. (A) IN THIS SECTION, "RETALIATORY ACTION" INCLUDES: 13 14 INCREASING THE RENT OR IMPOSING OTHER OBLIGATIONS ON A (1) 15 RESIDENT: DECREASING SERVICES OR FAILING TO COMPLY WITH OTHER 16 (2) 17 OBLIGATIONS OF A PARK OWNER; BRINGING OR THREATENING TO BRING AN ACTION FOR POSSESSION 18 (3) 19 AGAINST A RESIDENT; 20 (4) REFUSING TO RENEW A RESIDENT'S RENTAL AGREEMENT; OR VIOLATING A RESIDENT'S PRIVACY, HARASSING A RESIDENT, OR 21 22 USING ANY OTHER FORM OF THREAT OR COERCION AGAINST A RESIDENT. A RESIDENT IS PROTECTED AGAINST RETALIATORY ACTION BY THE PARK 23 (B) 24 OWNER IF: 25 THE RESIDENT MADE A GOOD FAITH COMPLAINT TO THE PARK (1) 26 OWNER; 27 THE RESIDENT MADE A GOOD FAITH COMPLAINT TO A GOVERNMENT (2) 28 AGENCY AGAINST THE PARK OWNER: 29 (3) THE PARK OWNER RECEIVED A NOTICE OF VIOLATION FROM A 30 GOVERNMENT AGENCY THAT AFFECTED THE PREMISES RENTED BY THE RESIDENT;

THE RESIDENT COMMUNICATED IN GOOD FAITH WITH PUBLIC

31

34

(II)

(III)

33 AGREEMENT, OR A LAWFUL DIMINUTION OF SERVICES; OR

UNOFFICIAL COPY OF SENATE BILL 599 THE RESIDENT OR A GOVERNMENT AGENCY PROVIDED 2 INFORMATION TO THE PARK OWNER UNDER TITLE 6, SUBTITLE 8 OF THE 3 ENVIRONMENT ARTICLE; THE RESIDENT CONSULTED WITH A LAWYER OR FILED OR 5 PARTICIPATED IN A LAWSUIT AGAINST THE PARK OWNER; THE RESIDENT FILED OR PARTICIPATED IN A RENT ESCROW ACTION (7) 7 UNDER § 8A-1601 OF THIS SUBTITLE; THE RESIDENT ORGANIZED, WAS A MEMBER OF, OR PARTICIPATED (8) 9 IN A RESIDENTS' ORGANIZATION OR ANY OTHER LAWFUL ORGANIZATION; OR 10 (9) THE RESIDENT DID NOT CONSENT TO: 11 (I) THE PARK OWNER'S PROPOSAL OF A MIDTERM AMENDMENT OF 12 THE RENTAL AGREEMENT; OR THE PARK OWNER'S PROPOSAL OF A REGULATION OR RULE 13 (II)14 ADOPTED AFTER THE RESIDENT ENTERED INTO THE RENTAL AGREEMENT THAT 15 EFFECTS A SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION OF THE RENTAL AGREEMENT. A PARK OWNER MAY NOT TAKE RETALIATORY ACTION AGAINST A 16 (C) 17 RESIDENT BECAUSE THE RESIDENT ENGAGED IN ONE OR MORE PROTECTED 18 ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION (B) OF THIS SECTION. 19 THE RESIDENT HAS THE BURDEN OF PROVING THAT A MATERIAL 20 PURPOSE OF THE PARK OWNER'S ACTION WAS TO RETALIATE AGAINST THE 21 RESIDENT BECAUSE OF THE RESIDENT'S PROTECTED ACTIVITY. 22 RETALIATION IS A QUESTION OF FACT TO BE DETERMINED BY A 23 PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE, CONSIDERING ALL RELEVANT FACTS AND 24 CIRCUMSTANCES. EVIDENCE THAT THE RESIDENT ENGAGED IN A PROTECTED 25 26 ACTIVITY WITHIN 1 YEAR BEFORE THE ALLEGED RETALIATORY ACTION CREATES A 27 PRESUMPTION THAT THE PARK OWNER'S CONDUCT WAS IN VIOLATION OF 28 SUBSECTION (C) OF THIS SECTION. 29 THE PRESUMPTION DOES NOT ARISE IF: (2) 30 THE RESIDENT IS IN DEFAULT IN RENT; (I)

32 LEGAL NOTICE OF A PROPOSED RENT INCREASE, TERMINATION OF THE RENTAL

35 CODE COMPLAINED OF BY THE RESIDENT WAS CAUSED PRIMARILY BY LACK OF

THE RESIDENT ENGAGED IN THE PROTECTED ACTIVITY AFTER

THE VIOLATION OF THE APPLICABLE BUILDING OR HOUSING

- 1 REASONABLE CARE BY THE RESIDENT, A MEMBER OF THE RESIDENT'S FAMILY, OR
- 2 OTHER PERSON ON THE PREMISES WITH THE RESIDENT'S CONSENT.
- 3 (3) (I) THE PRESUMPTION IS REBUTTED IF THE PARK OWNER
- 4 INTRODUCES EVIDENCE OF A GENUINE, NONRETALIATORY REASON FOR THE PARK
- 5 OWNER'S ACTION.
- 6 (II) IF THE TRIER OF FACT DETERMINES THAT THE PRESUMPTION
- 7 IS REBUTTED, THEN THE TRIER OF FACT SHALL DETERMINE WHETHER THE
- 8 RESIDENT HAS ESTABLISHED BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE
- 9 PARK OWNER'S CONDUCT WAS IN VIOLATION OF SUBSECTION (C) OF THIS SECTION,
- 10 WITHOUT REGARD TO THE PRESUMPTION.
- 11 (F) (1) IF THE PARK OWNER ACTS IN VIOLATION OF SUBSECTION (C) OF
- 12 THIS SECTION, THE RESIDENT:
- 13 (I) MAY BRING AN ACTION OR COUNTERCLAIM AGAINST THE PARK
- 14 OWNER FOR DAMAGES AND ATTORNEY FEES; AND
- 15 (II) HAS A DEFENSE IN ANY ACTION FOR POSSESSION BROUGHT BY
- 16 THE PARK OWNER AGAINST THE RESIDENT.
- 17 (2) THE COURT MAY INVALIDATE ANY ACTION FOUND TO BE A
- 18 RETALIATORY ACTION.
- 19 (G) THIS SECTION SUPERSEDES ANY ORDINANCE ENACTED BY A COUNTY
- 20 THAT IS COMPARABLE IN SUBJECT MATTER.
- 21 SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect
- 22 October 1, 2006.