Texas RioGrande Legal Aid, Inc. 4920 North IH-35

4920 North IH-35
Austin, Texas 78751
Telephone (512) 374-2700
FAX (512) 447-3940 TDD (512) 417-8682
TOLL FREE 1-800-369-9270

Fred Fuchs - 512-374-2720

Date	
Ms. XYX Executive Director Housing Authority Street Address City, State, Zip Code	
-	t for Reconsideration of Decision; Notice of Intent
Dear Ms. XYZ:	
I am writing on behalf of our cliterminated from the Section 8 Housing effective Because decision is neither in accord with the preponderance of the evidence, I am addecision and reinstate Ms. Doe's assist	ng Choice Voucher Program the hearing officer's ne law nor supported by a asking you to reverse the
Ms. Doe is years old. S grandchildren residing with he in which Ms. Doe called the police on Authority, sent Ms. Doe a notice of assistance on See Exhi	er. Following an incident, the Housing proposed termination of
The letter listed as the grounds following: "Preponderance of evidence or drug-related criminal activity by: and knives on" T information, but advised Ms. Doe th decision. Ms. Doe timely appealed.	of involvement in violent : Incident involving guns The letter gave no other

The appeal hearing was held on ______. The hearing officer, Sam the Man, issued his decision on ______ upholding the termination. See Exhibit 2. Sam the Man wrote the following:

This decision is based on the fact that you did not comply with the Family Obligations which state you, a family member or your guests may not engage in criminal activity which may threaten the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises other residents or persons residing immediate vicinity. The Housing Authority terminate assistance if it determines preponderance of the evidence that the participant engaged in criminal activity regardless of whether he she has been arrested or convicted of activity.

See Exhibit 2. There is no analysis of the evidence at the hearing and no explanation of what Ms. Doe or other members of the household did that constituted criminal activity.

The hearing officer's decision does not comply with HUD's requirements that the hearing officer briefly state the reasons for the decision. See 24 C.F.R. § 982.555(e)(2009). HUD has explained that this means: "The statement of decision required by the regulation must be truly informative as to the reasons for the decision. This would include a short statement of the elements of fact or law on which the decision is actually based. A bare and conclusory statement of the hearing decision, that does not let the participant know the basic reasons for the decision, will not satisfy the regulatory requirement." 49 Fed. Reg. 12215, 12230 (March 29, 1984) (comment on final rule).

Moreover, the evidence at the hearing does not support the conclusion that Ms. Doe engaged in criminal activity. It does not show that a family member engaged in criminal activity. It does not establish that one of Ms. Doe's guests engaged in criminal activity.

In addition, and very importantly, Ms. Doe is the person who called the police and sought assistance on _____. In addition, the police report states that Ms. Doe asked the officer to issue a criminal trespass warning to _____, one of the persons present during the incident. It is ironic

that had Ms. Doe not called the police seeking help she would likely not be in this position today facing loss of her voucher assistance.

The regulations allow for termination of a Section 8 participant if "members of the household" engage in criminal activity that threatens the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of other residents." See 24 C.F.R. § 982.551(1) (2009) (emphasis added). Here, the only member of the household is Ms. Doe. She did absolutely nothing wrong. No legal basis exists to terminate Ms. Doe's voucher assistance. Moreover, even if it were legal, terminating the assistance of a victim is reprehensible. It sends exactly the wrong message.

The evidence at the hearing consisted of the following: (1) testimony by Ms. Doe, (2) testimony by, the niece of Ms. Doe's deceased husband, (3) letters from three neighbors verifying that Ms. Doe is a good neighbor (See Exhibits 3, 4, and 5), (4) a character reference letter from an individual named saying she knows Ms. Doe through her employer,, and stating that she is "a very strong woman with very high morals and values," (Exhibit 6), and (5) the police incident report (Exhibit 7).
The basis for the termination was an incident allegedly involving "guns and knives." See Exhibit 1. The only evidence of "guns and knives" at the incident on consists of a hearsay statement in the police report from a woman named, who lives in, State.
The investigating police officer stated that Mstold him the following:
ABC advised that DEF needed to use the bathroom so GHI

ABC advised that DEF needed to use the bathroom so GHI
allowed him to use the bathroom in While in the
apartment was talking withand
telling him she was going to get her knife and stab
him. ABC stated that she was playing around with
and this is how she always acts. ABC
reported that said, "that's ok I have the
heat." At this time pulled a black large
framed gun from his pants and held it to's
head. ABC stated several times that while he was
doing this he was smiling and appeared to be joking
around like she was. ABC said that during this time

nothing else was said and no threats were made.

. ...

At the bottom of her statement, Sgt. ______ requested that she state that she did not want to proceed with filing charges, to which she did.

See Exhibit 7 (emphasis added). This is not a case in which the police officer says in his report that he observed illegal conduct. In addition, there is <u>no</u> evidence that anyone had a knife. The police officer wrote in his report that ______ told him that she told ______ she would get her knife and she was "playing around with ______." She did not say she displayed a knife. Such conduct, even if assumed to be true, may be stupid, but it does not constitute criminal conduct.

A hearing officer in a voucher termination case may consider hearsay. But, the courts have held that termination decisions based on hearsay are suspect. See, e.g., Basco v. Machin, 514 1177 $(11^{\overline{th}}$ Cir. 2008) (holding that a PHA illegally terminated a participant for allegedly permitting unauthorized persons to live in the unit; reasoning that a PHA termination decision premised on an address listed in police reports was legally insufficient to establish a program violation); Young v. Maryville Housing Authority, No. 3:09-CV-37, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 56539, *20-23 (E.D. Tenn. July 2, 2009) (noting that the police report on which the hearing officer relied consisted entirely of an officer's summary of statements made by the parties and was double hearsay; holding that plaintiff should have been given the opportunity to cross-examine the officer and the complaining party with respect to the statements attributed to them in the police report and relied on by the hearing officer); Edgecomb v. Housing Authority of the Town of Vernon, 824 F. Supp.312 (D. Conn. 1993) (ordering reinstatement of Section 8 voucher participant because hearing officer's decision based solely on hearsay police report and newspaper articles). Here, we have double hearsay -- the police officer is reporting

whatallegedly told him, not what he observed. The officer has no personal knowledge of whether Ms
is telling the truth. But, more importantly, even if it is assumed was telling the truth, her statements do not show any criminal conduct that supports termination of Ms. Doe's voucher.
Additionally, even if the regulations permitted termination of assistance for the criminal activity of a guest that disturbs the peaceful enjoyment of the premises, none of the persons involved was a guest of Ms. Doe on As you know, HUD defines a "guest" as follows:
Guest means a person temporarily staying in the unit with the consent of a tenant or other member of the household who has express or implied authority to so consent on behalf of the tenant.
24 C.F.R. § 5.100 (2009) (emphasis added). Neither nor nor the man named were Ms. Doe's guests - that is, temporarily staying in the apartment.
Ms. Doe's niece,, who lives in apartment at XYZ Apartments, testified at the hearing that lives in the State of and was staying with her at the time. She further testified that shortly after the incident returned to
As previously noted, the police officer's report shows that lives in No one has alleged that the man named was staying in the apartment. Ms. Doe testified that these persons had come to her apartment only because she had agreed to baby-sit their children that evening.
Finally, the hearing officer did not give any consideration to
Ms. Doe's unique circumstances. She is bi-polar, manic-depressive and has She lives on

including mitigated circumstances into account and indicate

whether her did or did not choose to exercise that discretion).

If I do not hear from you by _______, I shall assume you will not reconsider, and we will file suit asking the appropriate court to order reinstatement. If a lawsuit is necessary, our office will seek to recover attorneys' fees from the Housing Authority for the time spent on this matter and appropriate damages.

Finally, this letter is not intended to advise you about your legal rights and responsibilities. I have set forth our legal position in some detail to facilitate your decision. You must consult with your attorney with any questions you may have about the law.

I appreciate your courtesy in considering this request. My desire is to resolve this matter without litigation. You are welcome to call me to discuss this further, but you must obtain legal advice from your attorney.

Sincerely,

Fred Fuchs

Sent by Fax and First Class Mail

xc: Client