

03 May 2021

To: Senate Committee on Housing and Development

Re: House Bill 2364 A

Dear Chair Senator Jama, Vice-Chair Senator Linthicum, and members of the Committee:

Why is this further intrusion on the private property rights of rental owners needed? Is it because they're providing housing to those that need it? Do sponsors and supporters of this bill think rental property owners haven't had enough restrictions placed on them yet?

Or perhaps that tenants not been favored enough yet? Just what is a tenant's right to what a property owner has spent his time, money and energy on? Well, it seems to be more and more each week.

Why in the world do tenants require first refusal to purchase a house they're in? And what makes the sponsors/supporters of this bill think they don't already get it?

Is this bill to minimize and restrict benefits an owner might enjoy if other offers are pending?

Odds are that there is one tenant (so to speak) for each rental provider. Are rentals standing vacant? Why are benefits flowing out of the legislature like water through a sieve while any benefit to rental property owners moves like turtles racing in peanut butter?

Where is the much-ballyhooed *equity* in this picture?

If the sponsors of this bill are rejecting the idea of rental property owners being left to handle their own affairs due to humankind's fallibility or moral weakness, then they must for the same reason reject every sort of legislative action they come up with. But of course, they don't—yet hold themselves superior to the average rental property owner.

This legislation is not needed. This legislation is merely driving another wedge between rental property providers and tenants.

Sincerely,



Richard Wisner