

Rosenberg Corey

From: WMC Housing LLC <wmchousing@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 10:50 PM
To: SHS Exhibits
Subject: No to HB 2004-A

I hope my words will be considered.

I am a landlord and I am opposed to HB 2004-A bill!

As landlords we should have the right to terminate bad tenants . I understand and agree to give bad tenants 3 warning and a 90 days' written notice. But what I don't agree is why in the world do landlords have to pay the relocation of bad tenants. Way?!

When tenants signed the lease to not violate the rules and regulations it is expected from tenants to keep that promised. Of course the landlords rules and regulations should be legally excepted in the state of OR. If tenants break the rules and regulations after being fairly given three warning then landlords should have the right to terminate the lease without payment of relocation expenses.

Why, as landlords with the money we invested to purchased the properties have to be subjected to losing our rights to protect our own rental properties?

The HB 2004-A is giving tenants with bad intentions the leverage to be bad tenants without having consequences. They can do what they pleased and if the landlords don't like it well..... too bad because they know the landlords will have to pay for their relocation expenses. Please tell me how can this be fair to landlords?

I never had to terminate a tenant because so far I had great tenants. But, if one day I have a tenant that is breaking the agreements then I should have the righteous to exercise my right to terminate the tenants' without paying for their relocation.

Please, put yourself in the landlords position also.

Kindly appreciated,

Mary N.