Home Sweet Home

Bay Federal Credit Union specializes in mobile and manufactured home loans.

- Financing for leased land and Co-ops
- New Purchase and Refinancing

Visit a branch or apply online today at www.bayfed.com.

Filling the Void

AB 2120 is a loss for all mobilehome owners and a wake up call for advocacy groups. But there is an alternative. MH Life Magazine is offering our FAQ Handbook, a “reference guide” available to them that explains many of the more important laws from the MRL in simple, concise, easy to understand language. To order, use the form on page 11.

You can also download an updated MRL from this website: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/codes/mobilehome-special-occupancy-parks/docs/mrl.pdf

No Automatic Distribution of the Mobilehome Residency Law

A bill to eliminate the automatic delivery of the Mobilehome Residency Law (MRL) to park residents in California was sponsored by Western Manufactured Housing Communities (WMA - the park owners group) and passed uncontested. On July 15, 2010 Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 2120 into law, releasing parks from their obligation to deliver the MRL by February 1st every year, beginning 2011. The following is an analysis of the bill by the state assembly:

The MRL is California’s landlord-tenant law for mobilehome parks. When a homeowner signs a rental agreement in a mobilehome park, a copy of the text of the MRL must be attached as an exhibit. Anytime the MRL is significantly changed, park management must provide a new copy of the MRL to every homeowner by February 1 of the next year. This requirement has been in statute since 1981. The MRL has been changed through legislation every year since then and is significantly longer than it was in 1981.

As of 1/1/2011, AB 2120 requires the management of a mobilehome park to either provide a new copy of the MRL to all homeowners when the law changes or notify all homeowners that the law has changed and provide a free copy upon request.

Advertising in MH Life Magazine

Display ad cost/issue

1/8th page: $100
1/4 page: $150
1/2 page: $250
Full page: $400

Call Frank at 818-886-6479 or email him at fawodley@yahoo.com
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The Value of MH Life Magazine - An Opinion by Sam Meng

When hearing the word “advocacy”, one probably wouldn't first think of publishing a magazine. However, realizing why the freedom of speech and of the press is our First Amendment right, it becomes clear what the driving force of advocacy is, namely CHANGE and proper checks on our government. Communication is key in making any changes in society, whether positive or negative. That is why a magazine reaching mobilehome residents, publishing what residents are going through and updating residents on current events affecting all of our everyday living, is invaluable as a tool in advocating for mobilehome residents.

From history, one can definitely see the influence of the media in influencing the people. Thomas Paine’s Common Sense and some Founding Fathers’ The Federalist Papers had influenced many to seek independence from Great Britain and institute a government under the U.S. Constitution, the first of its kind which many other governments emulated. On the other hand, William Randolph Hearst’s yellow journalism (Hearst is known for the not historically accurate, “You furnish the pictures and I’ll furnish the war”), instigated many Americans in supporting a war that wasn’t all noble. Lastly, current events, such as the attempted military coup in Turkey, shows how social media had helped caused the coup to fail, even though the military controlled other types of communications.

Looking at the history of COMO-CAL’s The Voice and subsequently Mobilehome Magazine and MH Life Magazine, much has been accomplished:

- In September 2009 we published an expose on park owner Maurice Priest, long time lobbyist and corporate council for GSMOL. One month after our article, Maurice Priest was replaced by Brian Augusta, Christine Minnehan and Bruce Stanton. Christine was a breath of fresh air; however she didn’t last very long.

- We were at the forefront of the Eminent Domain Propositions in 2006 and 2008. We warned the community, more than a month before any other advocate, that the Eminent Domain propositions would eliminate rent control in California.

- We worked with the community to help defeat the Eminent Domain Propositions and sent out cards and magazines to mobilize the mh community.

- On Enforcement. In 1987, advocate leaders warned the Senate Select Committee that the form of enforcement, i.e. hiring an attorney and going to court, didn’t work. Yet, 29 years later, nothing has been done! No other advocate is providing this information. We wonder why. Perhaps attorney led organizations do not want change.

- We have presented enforcement alternatives: a) The Washington State Alternate Dispute Resolution Program. b) Using ELTH and ASK for failure to maintain litigation. c) The use of the magazine to expose unscrupulous park owners. d) And several more.

- Teamwork & Unity. Our message, for 12 years, has been: Let’s work together. We have reached out to many advocates over the years; however most advocates are only about egos, and power. Not about working with other advocates.

- We have encouraged readers to form resident associations.

- We have conducted many reader surveys over the years. You know what you want; however you are not willing to take action.

- Our magazines and newsletters have provided hundreds of thousands of mh owners information they would not otherwise have. Information about successful lawsuits, about issues in mobilehome parks, about residents losing their homes because of interference of sales, etc.

- Our motto: Unity, Education and Communication. It still rings true today.

- Strength in Numbers. Knowledge is Power.

- We have warned that new legislation is worthless without enforcement. It’s just like speed laws without the Highway Patrol.

- We have promoted resident ownership.

- We have exposed the leadership of our ‘go to’ advocate for destroying a once formidable organization.

- All the while, we have been transparent. All articles are backed by documentation. We make nothing up for our own benefit.

What is the real reason why our country is still here, with many positive changes that we have taken for granted today? It is because of people like you and me exercising our First Amendment rights. It is free communication with each other that is what keeps our government in check and allows us to organize for change. Obviously, the people are not done changing our government for the better. A free magazine distributed to mobilehome residents, by mobilehome residents, for the benefit of mobilehome residents is without value, as it is a driving force for future positive changes for mobilehome residents.
Residents Do Have Rights

We are excited to report the jury award on page 5. Although Terrace View Mobile Home Park is probably the exception, the award clearly shows that residents do have rights. The ‘complaint’ was filed three years ago! (it is available on www.comocal.org - July 12th Update on the home page). Imagine the stress those involved in the lawsuit felt; however it was all worth it in the end!

They have helped blaze a trail for all mh owners who face similar challenges.

The ASK Law Group (see below) represented the homeowners. They have been the ‘go-to’ attorney group for failure to maintain litigation for a number of years. Usually they settle out of court, but in this case a jury was involved.

ASK LAW GROUP

THE STORY OF ASK

In 1987, six attorneys with a singular vision started a law firm here in San Diego. The firm was named for four of its founders, Endeman, Lincoln, Turek & Heater (ELTH), and quickly earned a reputation as a group of effective trial lawyers and tough negotiators. The firm grew larger, but it never outgrew its dedication to winning justice for its clients.

Since 1987, ELTH has remained true to its founding principle: to represent all clients—individuals, medical practices, counties, cities, and corporations—with the drive and dedication they deserve.

Located in the heart of San Diego’s financial neighborhood, the most significant change to the group was made in 2014. To reflect the firm’s current managing partners, Jim Allen, David Semelsberger, and George Kaelin, the name evolved to ASK Law Group.

WHAT SETS OUR FIRM APART FROM OTHERS?

Collected more than $300 million as a firm
Offering effective, efficient counsel for all clients
AV® Rated and Super Lawyers® inclusion
Remain accessible and provide personal attention
Relentless in resolving our clients’ cases

DELIVERING PERSONALIZED SERVICE & SUPPORT

When it comes to selecting a legal professional or firm to represent your rights, you undoubtedly have many options to choose from. At ASK, we believe the reason clients choose to work with us is not just our credentials and proven experience, but our commitment and care for their cases. We are responsive throughout our client’s cases, remaining on top of their legal matters every step of the way. Our San Diego attorneys have an unrelenting passion for resolving complex situations for the individuals and companies we represent.

Over the last few decades, we have provided reliable, solid counsel for clients in the face of heated and confusing legal battles. Throughout each and every case, we have been accessible, honest, and available, always delivering personalized approaches and legal solutions. As a larger firm, we have the resources to tackle major cases paired with the attention and support found at smaller firms. That is something that truly sets us apart from other firms in the area.

Interested in learning more about our firm and what we can do for your case? Call us at (888) 675-8115

DO I HAVE A CASE AGAINST MY PARK OWNER?

At ASK Law Group, we take pride in protecting our clients’ best interests and rights. When you come to our legal team, we will get to work right away investigating the details of your situation and compiling evidence for your strong and compelling case.

We can represent individuals in disputes involving:
• Failure to maintain common areas & streets
• Failure to maintain drainage, sewer, electrical and water systems
• Overcharges for utility services
• Refusal to allow access to common areas
• Park closure and conversion
• Any type of real estate fraud

If you are enduring unfair treatment from your park owner, do not hesitate to reach out to our firm for counsel. We can review your case, present your legal options, and help you move forward with the correct steps. Our San Diego mobile home park attorneys are tough negotiators and know how to take matters all the way to court. You can trust your mobile home case to us today!

http://www.asklawgroup.com/
Jury Awards $58,389,000 to 10 Households of the Terrace View Mobile Home Park in San Diego

SAN DIEGO, July 6, 2016
Miguel Aranda, et al. v. Terrace View Partners, L.P.
San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2013-00057526

Today, a San Diego civil jury awarded 10 households of the Terrace View Mobile Home Park $58,389,000 in compensatory and punitive damages against the Park owners, Tom Tatum & Jeff Kaplan. The case involved charging unreasonable rents and other illegal practices causing residents to lose their homes.

At the time of trial, 100 of the 200 spaces at the Terrace View Mobile Home Park were empty or abandoned due to the park owners’ practices. This is the first phase of 49 homes that are part of the lawsuit.

The case was tried by James Allen and Jessica Taylor of San Diego based firm Allen, Semelsberger & Kaelin

Text From Complaint No. 37-2013-00057526

Below we present excerpts from the 45 page Complaint which was filed in July 2013 by the ASK attorney group representing some households of the Terrace View Mobile Home Park.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION - NUISANCE**

Defendants maintained both a per se public nuisance and a common-law nuisance on their property by substantially failing to provide and maintain the Park’s common areas, facilities, services, and physical improvements in good working order and condition.

As a proximate result of Defendants’ creation and maintenance of a nuisance, Plaintiffs have suffered general and special damages including: a leasehold worth less than the rent they paid; overpayment of rent and other charges; mental suffering; emotional distress; annoyance; discomfort; bodily and personal injury; medical expenses; property damage; cost of repairs; loss of wages; loss of use and enjoyment of their homes and the Park; and, loss of the value of their home, and/or diminution in value of their homes, which
damages are different in kind from those suffered by the general public.

Plaintiffs notified Defendants of the foregoing conditions and made numerous complaints to them and local governmental agencies about Defendants’ failure to maintain the Park’s common areas, facilities and physical improvements in good working order and condition. Defendants deliberately chose to ignore Park problems and have refused to fix or remedy these problems.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
BREACH OF CONTRACT

The essential common provisions are that Plaintiffs agreed to pay rent in exchange for Defendants’ promise to: (1) provide and maintain the Park’s common areas, facilities, services and physical improvements in good working order and condition; (2) provide a lot in safe, habitable condition; (3) enforce Park rules and regulations consistent with the requirements of Civil Code section 798.15; (4) deal with Plaintiffs in good faith; and, (5) preserve Plaintiffs’ quiet enjoyment of their premises.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
ILLEGAL CHANGE OF USE OF PARK

It is illegal for a parkowner to change the use of the park or any portion of the park without properly completing an impact report and paying to relocate affected Park residents.

Unlike apartment building owners, mobilehome parkowners do not have an absolute right to convert an existing mobilehome park or mobilehome spaces to another use. Any change of use for a mobilehome park requires compliance with state laws and local ordinances.

Defendants accomplished the illegal change of use by: refusing to approve prospective purchasers of Class Members’ mobilehomes; failing to maintain the Park’s infrastructure and appearance; and, raising rents to unreasonable levels. As a result Class Members are unable to sell their homes and often have no other choice but to walk away from their homes or to sell them to the Defendants for almost nothing. Defendants either remove the mobilehomes from the space or leave the mobilehome vacant. Defendants thereby have illegally changed the use of the Park without paying the relocation costs mandated under state and local laws, as well as violated Civil Code sections 798.73 and 798.74, and the Park rules, by converting the use of the mobilehome space to a vacant lot or leaving a vacant mobilehome on the space. Additionally, Defendants will not permit mobilehomes to be placed on the empty lots and refuses to sell the vacant mobilehomes, thereby illegally changing the use of this portion of the Park. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION - NEGLIGENCE

Defendants forced Plaintiffs to live in filth and degradation by ignoring these conditions. Defendants had the financial ability to abate and remedy the above problems, but out of greed deliberately chose to let Plaintiffs suffer rather than make any repairs. By forcing Plaintiffs to live in unhealthful an unsafe conditions, Defendants subjected them to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights. When Plaintiffs sought to assert their rights, Defendants retaliated by harassing Plaintiffs through various actions. By ignoring Park problems, Defendants consciously disregarded Plaintiffs’ rights and safety. Defendants acted despicably by treating Plaintiffs as mere chattel. Defendants’ above conduct was carried on by Defendants with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights and safety.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION - INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH PROPERTY RIGHTS

The MRL grants Class Members a right to place, and sell in place, their mobilehomes in the Park. Defendants cannot withhold approval of a buyer of a Class Member’s home if the purchaser has the financial ability to pay the rent and charges of the park unless Defendants can demonstrate that based on prior tenancies the buyer will not comply with the rules and regulation of the Park. If the approval of a purchaser is withheld for any other reason, defendants are liable for all damages proximately resulting therefrom. Class Members also have the right to quiet enjoyment of their property, and consequently Defendants may not enter upon a Class Member’s space without their prior written consent. Class Members also have the right to be free from public nuisance and consequently Defendants must provide and maintain physical improvements in the common facilities in good working order and condition.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION - BREACH OF DUTY OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING (CONTRACT)

59. Plaintiffs have a significant investment in their homes, including landscaping and other installation costs. Plaintiffs’ homes are very costly to move and highly
susceptible to damage if moved. The State Legislature has recognized these factors in California Civil Code section 798.55.

60. There is an extreme shortage of mobilehome rental spaces in the Park’s vicinity in which to move.

61. The difficulty and expense of moving their homes, combined with the rental-space shortage, place Plaintiffs in an inherently unequal bargaining position, making them economic hostages of Defendants.

62. Because Plaintiffs do not have the option, like an apartment dweller, of simply moving their homes if they do not like the way Defendants maintained the Park, Plaintiffs necessarily placed their trust in Defendants to perform their maintenance responsibilities. Defendants were aware of Plaintiffs’ vulnerability and the trust placed in them.

63. There is an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing in Plaintiffs’ lease and rental agreements whereby Defendants promised to deal with Plaintiffs in good faith so as not to deprive them of the benefits of their agreements and by which Defendants cannot raise rents to unreasonably high levels, or illegally change use of the Park. Defendants have breached this implied duty of good faith and fair dealing by failing to maintain the Park as set forth herein and in paragraph 12, by raising rents to unreasonably high levels, by interfering with Plaintiffs’ ability to sell their mobilehomes, and by illegally changing the use of the Park.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION - BREACH OF STATUTES

98. Defendants forced Plaintiffs to live in filth and degradation by ignoring these conditions. Defendants had the financial ability to abate and remedy the above problems, but out of greed deliberately chose to let Plaintiffs suffer rather than make any repairs. By forcing Plaintiffs to live in unhealthful an unsafe conditions, Defendants subjected them to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights. When Plaintiffs sought to assert their rights, Defendants retaliated by harassing Plaintiffs through various actions. By ignoring Park problems, Defendants consciously disregarded Plaintiffs’ rights and safety. Defendants acted despicably by treating Plaintiffs as mere chattel. Defendants’ above conduct was carried on by Defendants with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights and safety.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION - CLASS ACTION FOR BREACH OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

Defendants have engaged and are engaging in unlawful, fraudulent and/or unfair business acts or practices that violate Business and Professions Code section 17200 by placing unlawful or unenforceable terms in the rental agreements, by taking advantage of a vulnerable group of customers, by inserting overreaching and/or unconscionable clauses in their rental agreements, by operating the Park with unsafe and defective conditions in violation of the specific state statutes, health an safety regulations and other housing laws alleged in this Complaint, by interfering with Plaintiffs’ right to sell their homes in place in violation of the MRL, by charging excessive rent for the Park leaseholds which are not worth the amount charged, and by engaging in a scheme to mislead Plaintiffs as consumers into believing through written promises in their rental agreements that Defendants would provide and maintain the Park improvements in good working order and condition at a level that would be worth the amount they paid to Defendants.

Civil Code section 798.55, which provides for unique protection of mobilehome owners from actual or constructive eviction, and in Health and Safety Code section 18250, which provides:

Because of the relatively permanent nature of residence in such parks and the substantial investment which a manufactured home or mobilehome represents, residents of mobilehome parks are entitled to live in conditions which assure their health, safety, general welfare, and decent living environment, and which protect the investment of their manufactured homes and mobilehomes.

103. Defendants have engaged and are engaging in unlawful an unfair business practices as alleged throughout this Complaint including, but not limited to, an attempt to actually or constructively evict Class Members by operating the Park with unsafe and defective conditions in violation of the state statutes and Health Department regulations alleged in this Complaint, and by interfering with Class Members’ right to sell their homes in place in violation of Civil Code section 798.74, section 798.71 (b), and/or section 798.81 and the other provisions of the MRL.

104. Plaintiffs have paid excess rent to Defendants for services and conditions that were never provided to them by Defendants. Plaintiffs have paid excess charges for utilities to Defendants because Defendants have improperly read some of Plaintiffs’ meters.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF WARRANTY OF HABITABILITY

Defendants forced Plaintiffs to live in filth and degradation by ignoring these conditions. Defendants had the financial ability to abate and remedy the above problems,
but out of greed deliberately chose to let Plaintiffs suffer rather than make any repairs. By forcing Plaintiffs to live in unhealthful an unsafe conditions, Defendants subjected them to cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights. When Plaintiffs sought to assert their rights, Defendants retaliated by harassing Plaintiffs through various actions. By ignoring Park problems, Defendants consciously disregarded Plaintiffs’ rights and safety. Defendants acted despicably by treating Plaintiffs as mere chattel. Defendants’ above conduct was carried on by Defendants with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights and safety.

**TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**BREACH OF THE COVENANT OF QUIET ENJOYMENT**

115. Implicit in Plaintiffs’ tenancy and/or rental agreements with Defendants and explicit in Civil Code section 798.26(a) is the covenant of quiet enjoyment giving rise to a duty in Defendants to preserve and/or not interfere with Plaintiffs’ quiet enjoyment of the premises.

116. Defendants have breached the covenant by failing to maintain the Park as set forth herein and in paragraphs 12 and 13, by interfering with Plaintiffs’ ability to sell their mobilehomes in place including by raising rents to unreasonably high levels, by illegally changing the use of the Park, and by Defendants’ other actions and conduct alleged in this Complaint.

**ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**FOR ELDER FINANCIAL ABUSE**

120. Defendants took, appropriated, obtained and/or retained or assisted in taking, appropriating, obtaining and/or retaining Senior Citizens’ mobilehomes by refusing to approve prospective purchasers of Plaintiffs’ mobilehomes, and by raising rents to unreasonably high levels. As a result Senior Citizen Plaintiffs were harmed and have been deprived of their right to sell their homes in the Park and have had to either walk away from their home or to sell them to Defendants for almost nothing.

121. Defendants’ actions and/or conduct alleged herein was done for a wrongful use, with intent to defraud and/or by undue influence by preventing Plaintiffs from selling their mobilehomes in place in the Park, or keeping them there at reasonable rent levels.

122. Defendants knew or should have known that their actions and/or conduct were likely to be harmful to Plaintiffs and would prevent Plaintiffs from being able to sell their mobilehomes in place in the Park and would result in Defendants taking the financial investments Plaintiffs have in their mobilehomes in violation of Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act. Defendants’ actions and/or conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs’ harm. Plaintiffs seek all damages allowed under the Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act and all other remedies otherwise provided by law (including, but not limited to, rescission) to compensate them for the harm proximately caused by Defendants.

**EDITOR’S COMMENTS**

Why publish 3 pages of excerpts from a complaint? The answer is simple. We want to provide all mh owners in California a guideline, a path to get justice, and a means to enforce the laws that protect you.

The Complaint uses several different law groups:

- The Civil Code (Mobilehome Residency Law)
- Title 25 (Health and Safety)
- The Business and Professions Code

The foundation for most complaints taken by either the ASK or ELTH attorney group is the park owners Failure to Maintain the park. As they state: We can represent individuals in disputes involving:

- Failure to maintain common areas & streets
- Failure to maintain drainage, sewer, electrical and water systems
- Overcharges for utility services
- Refusal to allow access to common areas
- Park closure and conversion
- Any type of real estate fraud

A secondary issue is manager harassment, intimidation and retaliation.

**THE FUTURE**

We are happy to see attorneys going to court and litigating before a jury. The award for residents of Terrace View is one of the highest in recent memory. Remember, residents of California Hawaiian won $111 million about a year ago. We hope this continues.

We also hope that other attorney groups will get involved. Ultimately we would like to see residents getting more of the award - right now the attorneys get 40% plus expenses.

This Complaint demonstrates a terrific way to enforce the laws that protect us. Our hope is that soon there will be other ways, such as the Alternate Dispute Resolution Program in Washington State.
Wow, time flies. It has been over three years since we published this article (April 2013, pages 8-9). And now the magazine is entering its sixth year!

We’ve come a long way since forming the Coalition of Mobilehome Owners, i.e. COMO-CAL, in 2004. In 2011 we brainstormed how to get important information to more folks, free of charge. Our answer was a magazine, supported primarily by advertising, that is delivered in parks by volunteer park residents.

Just like the Volkswagen (‘peoples car’) our goal was to make MH Life Magazine a magazine ‘by the people, for the people. Our goal was to give California mobilehome owners a VOICE!

It has been a struggle; however we’re proud of our accomplishments. Imagine, 20,000 free magazines delivered to the community each month (that was 2014).

MH Life Magazine, a magazine for the California mobilehome community, is delivered one of two ways to residents in California mobilehome parks: 1. A resident volunteers to deliver door to door. In this case we furnish enough magazines for the entire park. or 2. A resident subscribes by filling out the application on page 13. All subscribers get MH Life Magazine, for a year, delivered directly to the resident via the USPS.

Here is an excerpt from our original article in 2013:

Now, what about local areas? The publisher of Mobilehome Magazine wants to provide all mobilehome parks a FREE, LOCAL EDITION of Mobilehome Magazine. This will be published in addition to the California edition. Initially it would be 12-16 pages, published monthly in full color. Participating parks could submit content. Initially 3,000 magazines would be printed, so we are asking you to get on board. We would need perhaps 20 parks in a local area to participate in order to get started. There would be NO subscriptions to the Local Edition. Also it would be posted online for all to see.

How much would the local edition cost your park and/or your residents? Absolutely nothing. In fact you can make a little money if you help Mobilehome Magazine get advertising. It is a win-win-win situation! Your park wins (you can make a little money and have a free magazine for all your residents), residents win because they are connected, and getting good information, and Mobilehome Magazine wins because it’s goal is to network, organize and educate residents around California.

So what is our point? We are excited that a few local communities are working with us to publish local magazines. The South Bay Alliance, located in Carson, will begin distributing MH Life Magazine in their area. It will also be distributed in Huntington Beach and other local communities. It will contain information about local Kort and Scott parks and other important information.

We have already published three local magazines (Sacramento Mobilehome Living Magazine) in the greater Sacramento area and hope that the local community will begin using it as their VOICE.

Our efforts don’t stop there. We are working to build a network of parks in North Bay, and one in the San Gabriel Valley. Our goal is to give local advocates and residents a voice to help them network and work together.

Ultimately, our goal is to give all residents in parks in California a VOICE. The benefits are huge - everyone understanding the law and knowing they are not alone. Please get on board. Call or email Frank if you’d like to help. It is a win-win for all of us.

Thank you for your interest.
Senator Connie M. Leyva, chair of the California Senate Select Committee on Manufactured Home Communities, hosted a mobilehome community event on June 17, 2016 at Ontario, CA. The event consisted of a Q&A session regarding mobilehome issues answered by a panel consisting of Bruce Stanton of GSMOL, Henry Heater of ASK Law Group, Dick Bessire of WMA, and Sal Poidomani of HCD. The purpose of the meeting is to inform mobilehome residents on the laws affecting residents and possible solutions to their problems, and to let Senator Leyva understand what problems mobilehome residents are facing today. The meeting is video recorded and on YouTube: https://youtu.be/T7UHcCsDI

COMO-CAL and MRA representatives, Paul Masminster, Sam Meng, and Ken Meng, distributed COMO-CAL’s magazine to a crowd of over 75 people whom attended a meeting. Residents from Long Beach to Corona came to the meeting, addressing their questions and complaints to the panel. Many residents from Friendly Village Mobilehome Park of Long Beach, a park that is owned by Kort & Scott, complained of the living conditions they are living in and how slow the park owner is in fixing the park. Residents from Corona La Linda Mobilehome Park asked what they can do when the Park Owner, also Kort and Scott, arbitrarily raised the rent hundreds of dollars, and that the City of Corona is apathetic to pass rent control.

Other questions were raised such as title problems, other problems the HCD creates or can’t resolve, the “guest fee” charged by the park for having a guest living in one’s home, etc. Residents had pointed out that it was irrational to charge guest fees as residents do own the home, and that parks charges up to $450 a month per extra guest. Comments regarding retaliation from park managers are also prevalent.

These questions cannot be easily answered as there is no effective law nor enforcement granting relief to these mobilehome residents. Residents are only encouraged to unify as a group, find a lawyer to enforce the law, or simply be patient as the HCD is accommodating the park owner to ensure that there would be no park closure. Sam Meng then raised the question on whether California can pursue more enforcement on the law like the State of Washington, leading Senator Leyva to be intrigued and wanting to further investigate this option.

This meeting does show the many problems prevalent in the law, as Paul Masminster asked Dick Bessire, also a park owner, whether he knows any loopholes to the law, which he replied, “of course it depends on how you interpret it.” Though the meeting cannot solve any immediate problems, it did enlighten the Senator on what mobilehome residents are going through. She stated that she realized that residents have to live through this day by day, making it more unbearable, and that she is working hard to pass laws that can help mobilehome residents.

These meetings are important for residents to attend. It shows to the Senator our concerns and possibly can get your questions answered. Right now there are no future meetings scheduled, but any future meetings will be posted on the State Select Committee’s website. Also, many of residents’ questions are answered by the FAQ offered on their website, also linked on comocal.org.

During this time, you can voice your concerns about the current state laws to Senator Leyva’s office, encouraging Senator Leyva to implement more viable enforcement for mobilehome residents. The office also now receive our magazine, so if residents can write a good article on how a problem can be solved by the state, they can bring it to the editor to be published in the magazine.

Editor’s Note: We appreciate the efforts of Sam and Ken Meng and Paul Masminster to get out there are ask the hard questions.

The Senate Select Committee has not held a hearing in over 6 years, all the while mh owners are losing their homes, rents are increasing and park owners are violating the law. We have emailed Senator Leyva’s office, without response. We will continue our efforts to get the Senate Select Committee to meet with us and discuss future strategy.

There was much interest in closing loopholes in the Mobilehome Residency Law. We published an article by Sam Meng (February 2016, pages 12-13) and a follow-up article will be published in the October MH Life Magazine.

We ask GSMOL, their corporate attorney Bruce Stanton, Henry Heater of ELTH, and others to sit down and come up with a plan to close the loopholes. We will do our part to recommend necessary changes.

MH owners need more than rhetoric, they need action. And above all, they need a viable form of enforcement of the laws. Leaders have known for three decades hiring an attorney and going to court DOESN’T WORK!
Left to Right: Senator Connie Leyva, GSMOL attorney Bruce Stanton, attorney Henry Heater, Dick Bessire, President Bessire and Casenhiser Management Co., & Sal Poidomani, HCD.

Park residents and others who attended the Senator Leyva Conference in Ontario

Left to right: Ken Meng, COMO-CAL V.P., and Steffainie Reid, Senate Select Committee on Manufactured Home Communities.

Left to right: Ken Meng, COMO-CAL V.P., and attorney Bruce Stanton, GSMOL.

Left to Right: Ken Meng, COMO-CAL V.P., and representatives from Friendly Village MHP in Long Beach

Third fromRight: Senator Connie Leyva. Ken Meng and Sam Meng on Right. Others from Corona MH Parks
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