

Roberta DiMezza

From: Joseph Brennan <management@southernlendingllc.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 15, 2025 9:52 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE 5920

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

As a landlord, I have a tenant who lived in my property for several years and asked if they could have a dog. I reminded them that their lease clearly states dogs are not allowed. Despite this, they went ahead and got the dog anyway. When I discovered it, I told them to remove the dog, and they agreed to comply. However, after being told a third time to get rid of the dog, they suddenly emailed me a letter claiming the dog is now a service animal, with no further explanation. This feels like an abuse of the system. To make matters worse, I have another tenant living below them who has complained repeatedly about the dog. She says it's large, runs around all night in the small apartment, and keeps her awake—this is especially problematic since she has to wake up early for work at 5:30 AM. Now I'm stuck with this situation and feel it's incredibly unfair.

Let me know if you'd like further edits or advice on how to handle this situation!

I OPPOSE H 5920. Expanding protections for untrained "assistance animals" to match those of professionally trained service animals could lead to abuse, undermining landlord rights and tenant safety. Adding "housing status" as a protected class may create legal burdens, prevent landlords from verifying rental history or identity, and pose safety risks. Instead of broad policies that may backfire, we urge lawmakers to focus on education, support services, and collaborative solutions that balance housing access, property rights, and anti-discrimination efforts. Alternatively, I SUPPORT H5504 as a balanced solution for ESA protections.

Sincerely,

Joseph Brennan
745 Cranston St Apt 1A
Providence, RI 02907
management@southernlendingllc.com