

I am a conscientious property owner in Connecticut seeking to provide affordable, well maintained and safe residencies for my customers. It's imperative that frivolous complaints be dismissed and judgments be equitable, with reasonable damages, if any. When the complaint process skews outcomes to reward a few bad apples, good tenants throughout Connecticut feel that burden as property owners have no choice but to pass along those unfair costs in the form of higher rents to all tenants. This is same as stores passing along their losses from shoplifting to the law abiding customers.

1. **The Standard of Review should be raised** so that the Complainant can only request "Reconsideration" (Appeal) just one time - not have the right to appeal an unlimited amount of times driving the defense into making deals to avoid endless litigation costs.
 - a.) Respondents shall be extended the same right to Reconsideration as Complainants.
2. **A Complainant must SWEAR UNDER OATH** that their complaint is true and factual and must also be Notarized
 - a.) Restore the affidavit language that requires the complaint to make true and factual statements; the same condition required of Respondents.
3. **Damages should be limited to actual damages.** It was never intended to give Complainants a career in bringing housing complaints and asking for monetary damages that bear no rational relation to the injury or to the facts of the situation.
 - a.) Likewise, private attorneys should not be able to use the CHRO forum to bring discrimination cases- they should have to avail themselves of the regular court system like all other cases seeking monetary damages.
 - b.) Solicitations, like the Craig's list ad, should not be allowed. Its comparable to an underage minor being allowed to be hired to go into establishments to "sting" sellers of tobacco and alcohol- certainly allowed by the police, who can bring charges, but not allowed by members of the public or for attorneys wherein are seeking monetary gain in the form of "damages".
4. **Raise the "Burden of Proof"** so that a Complainant must show a Fair Housing violation by a preponderance of the evidence. Currently the standard is "Reasonable Cause" and is too low for a burden of proof as it **MUST BE MORE LIKELY** that discrimination occurred rather than **LESS LIKELY**.
5. **Complaints Must Be Pre-Screened** by a Merit Assessment Review before Respondents are subjected to the investigative process and submit a "Schedule A." Cases that are retaliatory and frivolous must be denied at an early stage.
6. **Secret tape recordings** of conversations are not permitted. Any Complainant having made any secret recording shall be grounds for immediate dismissal of that complaint.

Kevin Regan
Principal
REAP Partners