

Roberta DiMezza

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Scott Bonelli
<Scott@BigHeadStudio.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2026 8:54 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Oppose H7765

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

a longer period of time will increase the chances that a tenant will not pay rent for the remainder of their tenancy, leaving the landlord with only one month security to cover the remaining 2-4 months of the tenancy

As a local housing provider, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to House Bill 7765. While I understand the intent is to align termination notices with rent increase timelines, these two actions are fundamentally different and shouldn't be treated the same way.

The proposed extension for termination notices creates several serious issues:

Financial vulnerability - When a lease is terminated, there is a significantly higher risk of the tenant withholding the final months of rent. Since we are limited to a one-month security deposit, a longer notice period leaves landlords completely unprotected against multiple months of lost income and property damage.

Neighbor safety - In many cases, a lease is terminated because a tenant is disruptive or making neighbors feel unsafe. Extending that timeline forces other tenants to deal with those disruptions for a much longer period, which isn't fair to the rest of the rental community.

Termination vs. eviction - A termination notice simply establishes an end date for a contract; it is not the same as an eviction. Good landlords don't want to lose good tenants, but we need the flexibility to end a lease when a situation isn't working out.

I urge you to consider the unintended consequences this bill would have on small property owners and the safety of our rental communities. Please vote NO on HB 7765.

Thank you for your time and for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,

Scott Bonelli
97 Bracken St
Cranston, RI 02920
Scott@BigHeadStudio.com