

Ariana Costa

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Juneiry Duran <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 7:32 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: OPPOSE RENT CONTROL/JUST CAUSE H8109/S2294

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

I oppose this bill because it takes away a property owner's basic right to decide whether to renew a lease and effectively turns every tenancy into a permanent one. With Just Cause Eviction, even when there are legitimate issues, removing a tenant could become extremely difficult, and the language allowing tenants to permanently stay an eviction for nonpayment as long as they follow certain procedures makes it even harder to enforce leases. Combined with a 4% rent cap, this bill limits both flexibility and financial stability for housing providers. It shifts nearly all the risk onto property owners and makes it much more difficult to responsibly manage rental properties.

I am against just cause eviction laws and rent control measures. This bill not only removes a property owner's ability to serve a non-renewal notice to a resident at lease term's end, effectively granting residents a perpetual lease, but also imposes rent control with a maximum annual increase of 4%. Rent control policies are widely agreed upon by over 90% of economists to not work for overall affordability.

Although I acknowledge worries about the unjust removal of long-standing residents, I am convinced that this strategy is not the correct course of action and will adversely affect both property owners and residents. Advocates of just cause eviction argue that it shields long-time residents from unethical landlords. However, these constraints significantly curtail property owners' capacity to promptly tackle resident issues and expel disruptive or potentially harmful individuals. Such measures unsettle rental communities, clash with state laws addressing problematic properties, and deter investment in rental housing.

Under just cause eviction, housing providers can only evict residents for reasons explicitly listed in the law. While these protections seem reasonable, they hinder property owners from efficiently managing their properties. The bill mandates landlords to "show cause" and obtain a court order to terminate a lease, particularly challenging in cases involving criminal activities. This policy shifts the responsibility of providing proof and evidence of such activity to neighboring tenants. Most often, neighboring tenants have concerns with retaliation from problem tenants and may be uprooted from their own home out of fear. This scenario can be avoided when a landlord is free to exercise their rights and swiftly act.

Additional eviction and turnover is very costly. Property owners do not want to overzealously evict. The intention of a property owner is to generally attract stable, long-term, tenants, which means less loss due to vacancy and turnover costs which are in the thousands. It is untruthful to portray landlords as people who intend to remove people from their homes at any chance.

I am afraid that policies such as the one set forth in H809 and S2294 could have the potential to counteract many of the positive housing policies that have been set forth in Speaker Shekarchi's housing packages. As a state we must move in the direction of finding ways to work together and solving problems, rather than shifting blame and punishment amongst different parties. Please consider the detrimental impacts of this bill as well as any and all just cause and rent control bills would have. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Juneiry Duran
83 Pekin St
Providence, RI 02908
jduran88@hotmail.com