

## Anabella Mayorga

---

**From:** bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Rose Russell <user@votervoice.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 17, 2026 7:38 AM  
**To:** House Judiciary Committee  
**Subject:** Oppose H8141

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

There are tenants who make way more money than some property managers. I have quite a few of them earning 6 figure incomes. Why should they get free representation and not me? Equal protection under the law should be a right. Not to mention eager lawyers are already sitting outside the courtrooms looking for anyone they can help. That's enough. The delays this law would add will result in people unable to have a quick resolution to collect rent, re-rent and pay their mortgages.

The time frame for eviction cases has already been extended unreasonably. There are states where a property manager can file for eviction on the 2nd of the month when rent is not paid on the 1st.

That doesn't mean you must file for eviction immediately, but it's not a surprise when the 1st of the month comes around. It comes around every month. No one lets people walk out of the supermarket with a cart full of food without paying for it. Why would you jeopardize someones sacrifice to buy a home and provide a place for someone to live and not respect them by forcing them to risk losing their homes over extra delays in processing an eviction? This proposal should be criminal.

Please consider the following points on why I oppose H8141

- Mandates annual data reporting and surveillance of landlords, tenants, and legal outcomes, raising privacy concerns.
- No clear funding mechanism outlined; taxpayers may be burdened with high ongoing costs for legal representation, administration, and community education.
- Risk of duplication of services with existing legal aid organizations, leading to inefficiencies and wasted resources.
- Provides free attorneys to tenants only, potentially creating a legal imbalance in housing court that unfairly burdens small landlords who must pay their own legal fees.
- Could delay proceedings and increase litigation costs for landlords, including for justified evictions such as nonpayment or lease violations.
- Creates disincentives for landlords to rent housing, for fear of prolonged legal battles and legal entanglements.
- Could lead to increased housing costs or reduced rental availability, as landlords factor in the cost and risk of dealing with state-funded legal opposition.
- Imposes new lease requirements, potentially invalidating existing lease language and increasing legal risks for landlords.
- Demands public disclosure of landlords involved in eviction proceedings, which may unjustly stigmatize landlords regardless of case merits.
- Mandates sheriffs and constables to distribute state-created pamphlets during service of process, adding tasks outside their core duties.
- Imposes notice requirements on all residential leases, creating compliance headaches and legal exposure for property managers and landlords.
- The broad definition of "eligible individuals" and "covered proceedings" could allow for frivolous or strategic litigation to delay rightful evictions.
- May encourage tenant noncompliance or nuisance behavior, knowing legal aid is guaranteed and eviction becomes more difficult.

Please oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

Rose Russell  
26 Dexter St  
Providence, RI 02909  
rose02903@gmail.com