

Dear Maryland Delegates and State Senators:

This letter is written in response to HB 693/SB 481 Renters' Rights and Stabilization Act of 2024. Over the course of twenty-eight years as a housing provider, every unfortunate eviction has been attributed to irresponsible behavior on the part of the tenant who fails to fulfill one or more of three basic responsibilities: 1) Pay the rent on a timely basis as agreed on page one of every lease for the negotiated term. 2) Maintain the property by keeping the property sanitary and in compliance with basic city health and safety codes. 3) Be a good neighbor. Criminal activity, disruptive behavior or violating the quiet enjoyment of one's neighbors cannot be tolerated for the good of the community. These are reasonable eviction offenses. If the housing provider does not enforce these three basic rules, they do not get paid despite already providing a home to the tenant and or their property falls into costly disrepair. Lack of income means that the housing provider can't pay their mortgage, taxes, insurance or maintain the property which results in decreased services to all renters and contributes to blighted properties. Housing providers face exorbitant repair costs the longer a non-compliant tenant remains in a property while committing waste. Furthermore, the housing provider becomes an enabler of crime in the community when through law designed to discourage eviction, housing providers are forced to allow the tenant's actions to victimize the neighborhood.

Every year, the Maryland government imposes new rules on housing providers. Despite the continual modification of the court system in favor of the tenant, eviction rates are higher than ever, according to the Housing Secretary's numbers. In 2021, the Maryland Legislature passed (Real Property Article § 8-401(c)) which stipulates that after the initial 5-day grace period, housing providers must send tenants who are in arrears a NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE A COMPLAINT FOR SUMMARY EJECTMENT which extends their payment deadline by an additional 10 days before a housing provider can file in court as attempt to collect unpaid rent. Fifteen to eighteen days, depending upon how dates fall, is a long grace period. By the time the housing provider and tenant get to court two to three weeks later, the tenant is already, at minimum, a full month behind in rent. Due to the grace period, the housing provider is given a judgement for past and present rent putting the tenant two months behind. If the eviction data quoted by the Secretary is correct, there is proof that the 10-day extension does not prevent evictions. In fact, it creates evictions because the tenant is further in arrears by the time he gets to court. Furthermore, the rule exploits the financial vulnerability of those tenants who do fall behind by giving them a false sense of security to procrastinate seeking payment relief. Considering the direct correlation between the 10- day rule and the increase in evictions, it's hard to fathom that the Secretary 's solution to this government misstep is to blame housing providers for a crisis created by the state. Forcing housing providers to absorb the cost of a new artificially inflated eviction filing fee of \$93 acts as a punishment for them doing their job.

HB 693/SB 481 in every way desecrates the property owners' property rights. In addition to forcing housing providers to pay eviction filing fees without compensation, the legislation also negates our option to collect up to, two month's security deposit. In doing so, the state is crippling housing providers' risk evaluation tools and removes our ability to recoup costs of eviction and repairs which have increased over 30% since 2019. Furthermore, limiting our ability to sell our properties by imposing dictatorial regulation, artificially impedes our freedom to sell by creating a matrix of paperwork and time constraints not imposed on anyone else in the housing market. This amounts to discrimination against housing providers in the free market and an unconstitutional taking of property rights. HB 693/SB 481 pose a significant problem for the state's interest financially as imposing unconstitutional legislation on housing providers has historically resulted in municipalities paying significant monetary compensation to those who have been harmfully affected by the government's illegal taking of property rights. For these reasons, please vote NO on House Bill 693/SB 481. Please see the attached pictures of properties that fell into massive disrepair because the court system prevented timely removal of the offending tenant.

Sincerely,
Kevin and Kristine Adams
Adams Housing, LLC











































