# Leases II

## The Quest for Clean, Safe, and Affordable Premises

In feudal England, policy makers and government officials expressed little concern over the housing conditions of renters. The law was well-settled: Once a landlord turned over the right of possession, the tenant became responsible for maintenance of the leased property. If a tenant decided to live in squalor rather than complete basic repairs, that was the tenant’s problem, not the landlord’s worry. Although it may seem counterintuitive to modern readers (who rely on landlords to fix nearly everything), putting the burden on the tenant to maintain the property actually produced efficient results in the medieval world: landlords often lived long distances from their lessees, communication was slow, houses were simply constructed, and most tenants had the knowledge and skills to complete basic repairs.

The basic principle that tenants are responsible for their own living conditions remained unchallenged until the 1960s, when both academics and politicians expressed growing concern about the rental housing stock in central cities. Many worried that exploitative landlords were flouting safety regulations and taking advantage of tenants who had few housing choices as a result of their poverty and the rampant discrimination in the housing market. The problems in the poorest neighborhoods also had spillover effects in surrounding communities—disease, vermin, and fires do not respect municipal borders. In response to these problems, the law began to vest tenants with a new series of rights against their landlords. This subsection traces the evolution of these rights and explores the rise of legal tools to ensure minimum housing standards for all renters.

### 1. The Covenant of Quiet Enjoyment

Traditional common law principles do not leave renters completely defenseless against unprincipled landlords. Every lease, whether residential or commercial, contains a *covenant of quiet enjoyment*. Often this promise is explicitly stated in the lease contract. Where it’s not specifically mentioned, all courts will imply it into the agreement. The basic idea is that the landlord cannot interfere with the tenant’s use of the property. Most courts state the legal test this way: A breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment occurs when the landlord substantially interferes with the tenant’s use or enjoyment of the premises.

Consider the following hypothetical:

Little Bo Peep Detective Services rents the second floor of a four-floor building. A year into the five-year lease, the landlord suddenly begins a construction project designed to update the suites on the first floor. These renovations create loud noise and regular interruptions of electric service. The construction work has also made the parking lot inaccessible. Employees and customers need to walk a quarter-mile to access the building from a nearby parking garage.

Do these problems amount to a violation of the covenant of quiet enjoyment? To determine whether the interference is “substantial” courts generally consider the purpose the premises are leased for, the foreseeability of the problem, the potential duration, and the degree of harm. In this example, if the construction project lasts for more than a few days, then Little Bo Peep can most likely bring a successful claim against its landlord under the covenant of quiet enjoyment. The problems here are not mere trifles—the noise, lack of electricity, and inadequate parking fundamentally affect the company’s ability to use the property as they intended.

The difficult conceptual issue with the covenant of quiet enjoyment concerns the remedy. If the landlord breaks the covenant, what are the tenant’s options? After a breach, the tenant can always choose to stay in the leased property, continue to pay rent, and sue the landlord for damages.

Additionally, certain violations of the covenant of quiet enjoyment allow the tenant to consider the lease terminated, leave, and stop paying rent. Recall from earlier in the chapter that the landlord’s fundamental responsibility is to provide the tenant with possession (or, in some jurisdictions, the right to possession). From that principle, courts developed a rule that in cases where the landlord wrongfully evicts the tenant, all the tenant’s obligations under the lease cease. Imagine:

Landlord and tenant both sign a lease that reads, “Landlord agrees to provide Tenant with possession of 123 Meadowlark Lane for a period of 12 months beginning April 1. Tenant agrees to pay $100 per month.” After 4 months, however, the Landlord retakes possession of the property by forcing the tenant out and changing the locks.

Assuming the tenant hasn’t committed a material breach, the landlord’s actions constitute an obvious violation of the covenant of quiet enjoyment—the tenant can no longer use the property for any purpose. Thus, any eviction where the tenant is physically denied access to the unit ends the tenant’s obligation to pay rent and allows the tenant to sue for damages incurred from being removed from possession (A tenant could also sue to regain the unit). The law is very clear on this point. Relatedly, if the landlord denies the tenant access to some portion of the rented space (say, an allotted parking space) that, too, constitutes a breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment. The tenant subject to such a partial eviction has the option to terminate the lease and sue for damages.

But what if the landlord doesn’t physically interfere with her tenant’s occupancy? What if the landlord creates an environment that’s so miserable that the tenant is forced to flee? Is this an “eviction” that would allow the tenant to consider the lease terminated or must the tenant stay and continue paying rent while he brings a damages lawsuit

Notes and Questions

1. **Evolution of the doctrine.** As discussed above, English judges widely recognized that tenants could terminate the lease (and sue for damages) if the landlord physically denied them possession of the rented property. Eventually the basic concept was expanded to situations where the landlord commits some act that, while it falls short of an actual eviction, so severely affects the value of the tenancy that the tenant is forced to flee. This is known as *constructive eviction*.
2. **Basic constrictive eviction law.** To make a claim of constructive eviction a tenant must show that some act or omission by the landlord substantially interferes with the tenant’s use and enjoyment of the property. The tenant also needs to notify the landlord about the problem, give the landlord an opportunity to cure the defect, and then vacate the premise within a reasonable amount of time.
3. **Stay or go?** Why might a tenant contemplating bringing a constructive eviction claim worry about the requirement to vacate the premises? Is constructive eviction a more powerful remedy in a place like San Francisco, which has a very tight housing market, or Houston, which has more open units?
4. **Landlord’s wrongful conduct.** To make use of the doctrine of quiet enjoyment, the tenant must show that the landlord committed some wrongful act. There’s wide agreement that any affirmative step taken by the landlord that impedes the tenant’s use of the property can meet the requirement of an “act.” Examples would include burning toxic substances on the property, prolonged construction activities, or a substantial alteration of an essential feature of the leased premises. The trickier doctrinal question is whether a landlord’s failure to act can ever qualify as the wrongful conduct. Traditionally, courts hesitated to impose liability on landlords for their omissions, but the law of most states now asserts that a “lack of action” can constitute the required act. For example, a landlord’s failure to provide heat in the winter months is generally found to violate the covenant of quiet enjoyment. Some courts, nervous about unjustly expanding landlords’ potential liability, deem omissions wrongful only when the landlord fails to fulfill some clear duty—either a duty bargained for in the lease or a statutory duty.
5. **Troublesome tenants.** Suppose your landlord rents the floor above your apartment to the members of a Led Zeppelin cover band. If the band practices every night between the hours of 3:00 am and 4:00 am, could you bring a successful constructive eviction claim against the landlord?
6. **Third parties.**What if the Led Zeppelin cover band played every night at a club across the street? If the noise from the bar kept you awake, could you sue your landlord for constructive eviction?

### 2. The Implied Warranty of Habitability

Although the covenant of quiet enjoyment offers tenants some protections, the doctrine—without more—can leave renters exposed to dreadful living conditions. What if cockroaches invade a tenant’s apartment? Or a sewer pipe in the basement begins to leak? What if a storm shatters the windows of the apartment? Or a wall of a building falls down? Unless the landlord somehow caused any of these disasters (or had a clearly articulated duty to fix them) a tenant cannot bring a successful case under the covenant of quiet enjoyment. In *Hughes v. Westchester Development Corp.*, 77 F.2d 550 (D.C. Cir. 1935), for example, vermin invaded the tenant’s apartment, making it “impossible to use the kitchen and toilet facilities.” Despite the infestation, the court found that the tenant remained responsible for the rent because the landlord was not to blame for the bugs’ sudden appearance. Leases, the court ruled, contained no implied promise that the premise was fit for the purpose it was leased. If tenants desired more and better protection, they had the burden to bargain for such provisions in the lease.

All of this changed in the late 1960s and early 70s. The most lasting accomplishment of the tenants’ rights movement was the widespread adoption of the *implied warranty of habitability*. In the United States, only Arkansas has failed to adopt the rule. In a nutshell, the implied warranty of habitability imposes a duty on landlords to provide residential tenants with a clean, safe, and habitable living space.

Hilder v. St. Peter

478 A.2d 202 (Vt. 1984)

BILLINGS, Chief Justice.

Defendants appeal from a judgment rendered by the Rutland Superior Court. The court ordered defendants to pay plaintiff damages in the amount of $4,945.00, which represented “reimbursement of all rent paid and additional compensatory damages” for the rental of a residential apartment over a fourteen month period in defendants' Rutland apartment building. Defendants filed a motion for reconsideration on the issue of the amount of damages awarded to the plaintiff, and plaintiff filed a cross-motion for reconsideration of the court's denial of an award of punitive damages. The court denied both motions. On appeal, defendants raise [two] issues for our consideration: first, whether the court correctly calculated the amount of damages awarded the plaintiff; secondly, whether the court’s award to plaintiff of the entire amount of rent paid to defendants was proper since the plaintiff remained in possession of the apartment for the entire fourteen month period. . . .

The facts are uncontested. In October, 1974, plaintiff began occupying an apartment at defendants’ 10–12 Church Street apartment building in Rutland with her three children and new-born grandson. Plaintiff orally agreed to pay defendant Stuart St. Peter $140 a month and a damage deposit of $50; plaintiff paid defendant the first month’s rent and the damage deposit prior to moving in. Plaintiff has paid all rent due under her tenancy. Because the previous tenants had left behind garbage and items of personal belongings, defendant offered to refund plaintiff’s damage deposit if she would clean the apartment herself prior to taking possession. Plaintiff did clean the apartment, but never received her deposit back because the defendant denied ever receiving it. Upon moving into the apartment, plaintiff discovered a broken kitchen window. Defendant promised to repair it, but after waiting a week and fearing that her two year old child might cut herself on the shards of glass, plaintiff repaired the window at her own expense. Although defendant promised to provide a front door key, he never did. For a period of time, whenever plaintiff left the apartment, a member of her family would remain behind for security reasons. Eventually, plaintiff purchased and installed a padlock, again at her own expense. After moving in, plaintiff discovered that the bathroom toilet was clogged with paper and feces and would flush only by dumping pails of water into it. Although plaintiff repeatedly complained about the toilet, and defendant promised to have it repaired, the toilet remained clogged and mechanically inoperable throughout the period of plaintiff’s tenancy. In addition, the bathroom light and wall outlet were inoperable. Again, the defendant agreed to repair the fixtures, but never did. In order to have light in the bathroom, plaintiff attached a fixture to the wall and connected it to an extension cord that was plugged into an adjoining room. Plaintiff also discovered that water leaked from the water pipes of the upstairs apartment down the ceilings and walls of both her kitchen and back bedroom. Again, defendant promised to fix the leakage, but never did. As a result of this leakage, a large section of plaster fell from the back bedroom ceiling onto her bed and her grandson’s crib. Other sections of plaster remained dangling from the ceiling. This condition was brought to the attention of the defendant, but he never corrected it. Fearing that the remaining plaster might fall when the room was occupied, plaintiff moved her and her grandson’s bedroom furniture into the living room and ceased using the back bedroom. During the summer months an odor of raw sewage permeated plaintiff’s apartment. The odor was so strong that the plaintiff was ashamed to have company in her apartment. Responding to plaintiff’s complaints, Rutland City workers unearthed a broken sewage pipe in the basement of defendants’ building. Raw sewage littered the floor of the basement, but defendant failed to clean it up. Plaintiff also discovered that the electric service for her furnace was attached to her breaker box, although defendant had agreed, at the commencement of plaintiff’s tenancy, to furnish heat.

In its conclusions of law, the court held that the state of disrepair of plaintiff’s apartment, which was known to the defendants, substantially reduced the value of the leasehold from the agreed rental value, thus constituting a breach of the implied warranty of habitability. The court based its award of damages on the breach of this warranty and on breach of an express contract. Defendant argues that the court misapplied the law of Vermont relating to habitability because the plaintiff never abandoned the demised premises and, therefore, it was error to award her the full amount of rent paid. Plaintiff counters that, while never expressly recognized by this Court, the trial court was correct in applying an implied warranty of habitability and that under this warranty, abandonment of the premises is not required. Plaintiff urges this Court to affirmatively adopt the implied warranty of habitability.

Historically, relations between landlords and tenants have been defined by the law of property. Under these traditional common law property concepts, a lease was viewed as a conveyance of real property. *See* Note, Judicial Expansion of Tenants’ Private Law Rights: Implied Warranties of Habitability and Safety in Residential Urban Leases, 56 Cornell L.Q. 489, 489–90 (1971) (hereinafter cited as Expansion of Tenants’ Rights). The relationship between landlord and tenant was controlled by the doctrine of caveat lessee; that is, the tenant took possession of the demised premises irrespective of their state of disrepair. Love, Landlord’s Liability for Defective Premises: Caveat Lessee, Negligence, or Strict Liability?, 1975 Wis. L. Rev. 19, 27–28. The landlord’s only covenant was to deliver possession to the tenant. The tenant’s obligation to pay rent existed independently of the landlord’s duty to deliver possession, so that as long as possession remained in the tenant, the tenant remained liable for payment of rent. The landlord was under no duty to render the premises habitable unless there was an express covenant to repair in the written lease. Expansion of Tenants' Rights, supra, at 490. The land, not the dwelling, was regarded as the essence of the conveyance.

An exception to the rule of caveat lessee was the doctrine of constructive eviction. *Lemle v. Breeden*, 462 P.2d 470, 473 (Haw. 1969). Here, if the landlord wrongfully interfered with the tenant’s enjoyment of the demised premises, or failed to render a duty to the tenant as expressly required under the terms of the lease, the tenant could abandon the premises and cease paying rent. *Legier v. Deveneau*, 126 A. 392, 393 (Vt. 1924).

Beginning in the 1960’s, American courts began recognizing that this approach to landlord and tenant relations, which had originated during the Middle Ages, had become an anachronism in twentieth century, urban society. Today’s tenant enters into lease agreements, not to obtain arable land, but to obtain safe, sanitary and comfortable housing.

[T]hey seek a well known package of goods and services—a package which includes not merely walls and ceilings, but also adequate heat, light and ventilation, serviceable plumbing facilities, secure windows and doors, proper sanitation, and proper maintenance.

*Javins v. First National Realty Corp.*, 428 F.2d 1071, 1074 (D.C.Cir.), cert. denied, 400 U.S. 925, 91 S.Ct. 186, 27 L.Ed.2d 185 (1970).

Not only has the subject matter of today’s lease changed, but the characteristics of today’s tenant have similarly evolved. The tenant of the Middle Ages was a farmer, capable of making whatever repairs were necessary to his primitive dwelling. *Green v. Superior Court*, 517 P.2d 1168, 1172 (Cal. 1974). Additionally, “the common law courts assumed that an equal bargaining position existed between landlord and tenant. . . .” Note, *The Implied Warranty of Habitability: A Dream Deferred*, 48 UMKC L.Rev. 237, 238 (1980) (hereinafter cited as *A Dream Deferred*).

In sharp contrast, today’s residential tenant, most commonly a city dweller, is not experienced in performing maintenance work on urban, complex living units. *Green v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 517 P.2d at 1173. The landlord is more familiar with the dwelling unit and mechanical equipment attached to that unit, and is more financially able to “discover and cure” any faults and break-downs. *Id*. Confronted with a recognized shortage of safe, decent housing, see 24 V.S.A. § 4001(1), today’s tenant is in an inferior bargaining position compared to that of the landlord. *Park West Management Corp. v. Mitchell*, 391 N.E.2d 1288, 1292 (N.Y. 1979). Tenants vying for this limited housing are “virtually powerless to compel the performance of essential services.” *Id*.

In light of these changes in the relationship between tenants and landlords, it would be wrong for the law to continue to impose the doctrine of caveat lessee on residential leases.

The modern view favors a new approach which recognizes that a lease is essentially a contract between the landlord and the tenant wherein the landlord promises to deliver and maintain the demised premises in habitable condition and the tenant promises to pay rent for such habitable premises. These promises constitute interdependent and mutual considerations. Thus, the tenant's obligation to pay rent is predicated on the landlord's obligation to deliver and maintain the premises in habitable condition.

*Boston Housing Authority v. Hemingway*, 293 N.E.2d 831, 842 (Mass. 1973).

Recognition of residential leases as contracts embodying the mutual covenants of habitability and payment of rent does not represent an abrupt change in Vermont law. Our case law has previously recognized that contract remedies are available for breaches of lease agreements. *Clarendon Mobile Home Sales, Inc. v. Fitzgerald*, 381 A.2d 1063, 1065 (Vt. 1977). . . . More significantly, our legislature, in establishing local housing authorities, 24 V.S.A. § 4003, has officially recognized the need for assuring the existence of adequate housing.

[S]ubstandard and decadent areas exist in certain portions of the state of Vermont and . . . there is not . . . an adequate supply of decent, safe and sanitary housing for persons of low income and/or elderly persons of low income, available for rents which such persons can afford to pay . . . this situation tends to cause an increase and spread of communicable and chronic disease . . . [and] constitutes a menace to the health, safety, welfare and comfort of the inhabitants of the state and is detrimental to property values in the localities in which it exists . . . .

24 V.S.A. § 4001(4). In addition, this Court has assumed the existence of an implied warranty of habitability in residential leases. *Birkenhead v. Coombs*, 465 A.2d 244, 246 (Vt. 1983).

Therefore, we now hold expressly that in the rental of any residential dwelling unit an implied warranty exists in the lease, whether oral or written, that the landlord will deliver over and maintain, throughout the period of the tenancy, premises that are safe, clean and fit for human habitation. This warranty of habitability is implied in tenancies for a specific period or at will. *Boston Housing Authority v. Hemingway*, *supra*, 293 N.E.2d at 843. Additionally, the implied warranty of habitability covers all latent and patent defects in the essential facilities of the residential unit. *Id*. Essential facilities are “facilities vital to the use of the premises for residential purposes. . . .” *Kline v. Burns*, 276 A.2d 248, 252 (N.H. 1971). This means that a tenant who enters into a lease agreement with knowledge of any defect in the essential facilities cannot be said to have assumed the risk, thereby losing the protection of the warranty. Nor can this implied warranty of habitability be waived by any written provision in the lease or by oral agreement.

In determining whether there has been a breach of the implied warranty of habitability, the courts may first look to any relevant local or municipal housing code; they may also make reference to the minimum housing code standards enunciated in 24 V.S.A. § 5003(c)(1)–5003(c)(5). A substantial violation of an applicable housing code shall constitute prima facie evidence that there has been a breach of the warranty of habitability. “[O]ne or two minor violations standing alone which do not affect” the health or safety of the tenant, shall be considered *de minimus* and not a breach of the warranty. *Javins v. First National Realty Corp.*, *supra*, 428 F.2d at 1082 n. 63. . . . In addition, the landlord will not be liable for defects caused by the tenant. *Javins v. First National Realty Corp.*, *supra*, 428 F.2d at 1082 n. 62.

However, these codes and standards merely provide a starting point in determining whether there has been a breach. Not all towns and municipalities have housing codes; where there are codes, the particular problem complained of may not be addressed. *Park West Management Corp. v. Mitchell*, *supra*, 391 N.E.2d at 1294. In determining whether there has been a breach of the implied warranty of habitability, courts should inquire whether the claimed defect has an impact on the safety or health of the tenant. *Id*.

In order to bring a cause of action for breach of the implied warranty of habitability, the tenant must first show that he or she notified the landlord “of the deficiency or defect not known to the landlord and [allowed] a reasonable time for its correction.” *King v. Moorehead*, *supra*, 495 S.W.2d at 76.

Because we hold that the lease of a residential dwelling creates a contractual relationship between the landlord and tenant, the standard contract remedies of rescission, reformation and damages are available to the tenant when suing for breach of the implied warranty of habitability. *Lemle v. Breeden*, *supra*, 462 P.2d at 475. The measure of damages shall be the difference between the value of the dwelling as warranted and the value of the dwelling as it exists in its defective condition. *Birkenhead v. Coombs*, *supra*, 465 A.2d at 246. In determining the fair rental value of the dwelling as warranted, the court may look to the agreed upon rent as evidence on this issue. *Id*. “[I]n residential lease disputes involving a breach of the implied warranty of habitability, public policy militates against requiring expert testimony” concerning the value of the defect. *Id*. at 247. The tenant will be liable only for “the reasonable rental value [if any] of the property in its imperfect condition during his period of occupancy.” *Berzito v. Gambino*, 308 A.2d 17, 22 (N.J. 1973).

We also find persuasive the reasoning of some commentators that damages should be allowed for a tenant’s discomfort and annoyance arising from the landlord’s breach of the implied warranty of habitability. *See* Moskovitz, *The Implied Warranty of Habitability: A New Doctrine Raising New Issues*, 62 Cal. L. Rev. 1444, 1470–73 (1974) (hereinafter cited as *A New Doctrine*); *A Dream Deferred*, *supra*, at 250–51. Damages for annoyance and discomfort are reasonable in light of the fact that:

the residential tenant who has suffered a breach of the warranty . . . cannot bathe as frequently as he would like or at all if there is inadequate hot water; he must worry about rodents harassing his children or spreading disease if the premises are infested; or he must avoid certain rooms or worry about catching a cold if there is inadequate weather protection or heat. Thus, discomfort and annoyance are the common injuries caused by each breach and hence the true nature of the general damages the tenant is claiming.

Moskovitz, *A New Doctrine*, *supra*, at 1470–71. Damages for discomfort and annoyance may be difficult to compute; however, “[t]he trier [of fact] is not to be deterred from this duty by the fact that the damages are not susceptible of reduction to an exact money standard.” *Vermont Electric Supply Co. v. Andrus*, 315 A.2d 456, 459 (Vt. 1974).

Another remedy available to the tenant when there has been a breach of the implied warranty of habitability is to withhold the payment of future rent. *King v. Moorehead*, *supra*, 495 S.W.2d at 77. The burden and expense of bringing suit will then be on the landlord who can better afford to bring the action. In an action for ejectment for nonpayment of rent, 12 V.S.A. § 4773, “[t]he trier of fact, upon evaluating the seriousness of the breach and the ramification of the defect upon the health and safety of the tenant, will abate the rent at the landlord’s expense in accordance with its findings.” *A Dream Deferred*, *supra*, at 248. The tenant must show that: (1) the landlord had notice of the previously unknown defect and failed, within a reasonable time, to repair it; and (2) the defect, affecting habitability, existed during the time for which rent was withheld. *See* *A Dream Deferred*, *supra*, at 248–50. Whether a portion, all or none of the rent will be awarded to the landlord will depend on the findings relative to the extent and duration of the breach. *Javins v. First National Realty Corp.*, *supra*, 428 F.2d at 1082–83. Of course, once the landlord corrects the defect, the tenant’s obligation to pay rent becomes due again. *Id*. at 1083 n. 64.

Additionally, we hold that when the landlord is notified of the defect but fails to repair it within a reasonable amount of time, and the tenant subsequently repairs the defect, the tenant may deduct the expense of the repair from future rent. 11 Williston on Contracts § 1404 (3d ed. W. Jaeger 1968); *Marini v. Ireland*, 265 A.2d 526, 535 (N.J. 1970).

In addition to general damages, we hold that punitive damages may be available to a tenant in the appropriate case. Although punitive damages are generally not recoverable in actions for breach of contract, there are cases in which the breach is of such a willful and wanton or fraudulent nature as to make appropriate the award of exemplary damages. *Clarendon Mobile Home Sales, Inc. v. Fitzgerald*, *supra*, 381 A.2d at 1065. A willful and wanton or fraudulent breach may be shown “by conduct manifesting personal ill will, or carried out under circumstances of insult or oppression, or even by conduct manifesting . . . a reckless or wanton disregard of [one’s] rights . . . . ” *Sparrow v. Vermont Savings Bank*, 112 A. 205, 207 (Vt. 1921). When a landlord, after receiving notice of a defect, fails to repair the facility that is essential to the health and safety of his or her tenant, an award of punitive damages is proper. *111 East 88th Partners v. Simon*, 434 N.Y.S.2d 886, 889 (N.Y. Civ. Ct. 1980).

The purpose of punitive damages . . . is to punish conduct which is morally culpable. . . . Such an award serves to deter a wrongdoer . . . from repetitions of the same or similar actions. And it tends to encourage prosecution of a claim by a victim who might not otherwise incur the expense or inconvenience of private action. . . . The public benefit and a display of ethical indignation are among the ends of the policy to grant punitive damages.

*Davis v. Williams*, 402 N.Y.S.2d 92, 94 (N.Y.Civ.Ct.1977).

In the instant case, the trial court’s award of damages, based in part on a breach of the implied warranty of habitability, was not a misapplication of the law relative to habitability. Because of our holding in this case, the doctrine of constructive eviction, wherein the tenant must abandon in order to escape liability for rent, is no longer viable. When, as in the instant case, the tenant seeks, not to escape rent liability, but to receive compensatory damages in the amount of rent already paid, abandonment is similarly unnecessary. *Northern Terminals, Inc. v. Smith Grocery & Variety, Inc.*, *supra*, 418 A.2d at 26–27. Under our holding, when a landlord breaches the implied warranty of habitability, the tenant may withhold future rent, and may also seek damages in the amount of rent previously paid.

In its conclusions of law the trial court stated that the defendants’ failure to make repairs was compensable by damages to the extent of reimbursement of all rent paid and additional compensatory damages. The court awarded plaintiff a total of $4,945.00; $3,445.00 represents the entire amount of rent plaintiff paid, plus the $50.00 deposit. . . .

Additionally, the court denied an award to plaintiff of punitive damages on the ground that the evidence failed to support a finding of willful and wanton or fraudulent conduct. *See* *Clarendon Mobile Home Sales, Inc. v. Fitzgerald*, *supra*, 381 A.2d at 1065. The facts in this case, which defendants do not contest, evince a pattern of intentional conduct on the part of defendants for which the term “slumlord” surely was coined. Defendants’ conduct was culpable and demeaning to plaintiff and clearly expressive of a wanton disregard of plaintiff's rights. The trial court found that defendants were aware of defects in the essential facilities of plaintiff's apartment, promised plaintiff that repairs would be made, but never fulfilled those promises. The court also found that plaintiff continued, throughout her tenancy, to pay her rent, often in the face of verbal threats made by defendant Stuart St. Peter. These findings point to the “bad spirit and wrong intention” of the defendants, *Glidden v. Skinner*, 458 A.2d 1142, 1144 (Vt. 1983), and would support a finding of willful and wanton or fraudulent conduct, contrary to the conclusions of law and judgment of the trial judge. However, the plaintiff did not appeal the court’s denial of punitive damages, and issues not appealed and briefed are waived. *R. Brown & Sons, Inc. v. International Harvester Corp.*, 453 A.2d 83, 84 (Vt. 1982).

Notes and Questions

1. **Residential v. commercial.**  Unlike the covenant of quiet enjoyment, the implied warranty of habitability only applies to residential leases. Commercial tenants still largely operate under common-law legal rules. Commonly, commercial landlords and tenants do not rely on the default rules, but rather assign the duty of upkeep and repair with an express provision in the lease.
2. **What is habitability?**Do all defects in an apartment amount to violations? What is the standard of habitability as laid out in *Hilder*?
3. **Paternalism?**  Is the implied warranty of habitability too paternalistic? Some economists argue that the poorest Americans should have more freedom over how they spend their limited dollars. Isn’t it possible that some individuals might want to occupy a really cheap (if slightly dangerous) dwelling so that they have more money to spend on healthy foods, transportation, and clothes? Would it matter if the evidence showed that such apartments were in fact cheaper than “habitable” apartments?
4. **Necessary?**  Do you agree with the arguments made by the court in *Hilder* about the necessity of the implied warranty of habitability? Don’t landlords already have excellent incentives to maintain their buildings?
5. **Arkansas and beyond.** As mentioned above, Arkansas is the one state that has not adopted the implied warranty of habitability—either by statute or judicial fiat. Is Arkansas a Mad Max-style hellscape for renters? Are tenants there worse (or worse off) than the tenants in other states? Some people think so. *Vice* magazine recently dubbed Arkansas, “The Worst Place to Rent in America.” You can see the report on renting in Arkansas at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9G2Pk2JZP-E>. But does the implied warranty of habitability provide much practical protection? Do poor tenants know about it? Do they have the resources to push back against aggressive landlords who threaten lawsuits and other forms of retaliation? Professor David Super has suggested that the decision of tenants’ rights movement to focus on habitability over affordability and overcrowding was a strategic mistake. *See* David A. Super, *The Rise and Fall of the Implied Warranty of Habitability*, 99 Cal. L. Rev. 389-463 (2011). Is there a nirvana for renters anywhere?
6. **Procedure & remedies.** If a tenant believes his apartment does not meet the standard of habitability, he must first must notify the landlord of the defects and give the landlord a reasonable amount of time to cure the problems. If the landlord either cannot or will not make repairs, the implied warranty of habitability offers the renter a menu of options. Each option presents a different combination of costs and risks to the tenant. If the landlord breaches, the tenant may:
	1. *Leave, terminate contract*. The tenant may consider the lease terminated and move out.
	2. *Stay and sue for damages*. As with the covenant of quiet enjoyment, a tenant may stay in the unit and pay rent, while suing the landlord for damages. There is significant disagreement among jurisdictions about how to calculate damages. In *Hilder*, the court uses the difference between the rental price of the dwelling if it met the standard of habitability and the value of the dwelling as it exists; the rent charged is not evidence of actual value, but rather evidence of the appropriate price if it met the standard of habitability. [Note that given the court’s calculation, the value was apparently zero?] Other courts look at the difference between the amount of rent stated in the lease and the fair market value of the premises. What is the better approach? Should the rent charged be considered evidence of fair market value? If not, why not?
	3. *Stay and charge the cost of repair*. A tenant has the option to fix the defect and then deduct the cost of repair from the rent.
	4. *Stay and withhold rent*. In most jurisdictions, a tenant can withhold the entire rent for violations of the implied warranty of habitability (although, a cautious tenant should pay the rent into an escrow account). This is a very powerful remedy. First, it gives the landlord strong incentive to respond to valid complaints from tenants. Second, it puts the burden on the landlord (rather than the tenant) to initiate a lawsuit when contested issues arise. Finally, if the landlord does move to evict the tenant for non-payment, violations of the implied warranty of habitability can serve as a defense.
	5. *Extreme violations*. Tenants have won punitive damages in cases where the landlord committed repeated or gruesome violations of the implied warranty.

1. The Mad Hatter and the Alice each decide to rent an apartment in Wonderland. The Mad Hatter walks into a large apartment and sees a hole in the roof, but he decides to rent the unit anyway. The apartment that Alice decides to lease has no obvious problems. The next day, however, some mold spots appear by one of the vents. The mold grows rapidly and Alice starts to have regular headaches and some trouble breathing. Additionally, an unknown troublemaker smashed Alice’s air conditioning unit and it no longer works. Can either the Mad Hatter or Alice win a lawsuit against their landlord if their problems aren’t fixed?

### Tenant Selection

As we saw earlier in the textbook, the right to exclude remains a cornerstone of property ownership. Owners have expansive power to keep others off of their land and out of their homes. Generally speaking, this right extends to landlords, who have broad discretion to select tenants as they see fit. Landlords, for example, remain free to exclude smokers from their properties. They can also refuse to rent to a tenant who acts erratically, possesses a criminal record, or has a low credit score. Landlords, however, cannot violate state or federal anti-discrimination laws when they go through the leasing process.

The Civil Rights Act of 1866

One of the oldest laws that protects tenants against discrimination in the housing market is the Civil Rights Act of 1866. Passed in the aftermath of the Civil War, the Civil Rights Act of 1866 prohibits all discrimination based on race in the purchase or rental of real or personal property. *See Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co.*, 392 U.S. 409 (1968). Thus, landlords cannot deny an apartment unit to a potential tenant based on tenant’s heritage or the color of their skin. There are no exceptions.

The Fair Housing Act of 1968

The Fair Housing Act of 1968 (and its many amendments) greatly expanded the number of individuals covered by anti-discrimination law. Broadly speaking, the Fair Housing Act (FHA) prohibits discrimination in the renting, selling, advertising, or financing of real estate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, and disability. It is worth looking closely at some of its provisions. The Act begins with a statement of policy and a few (counter-intuitive) definitions:

§3601. Declaration of Policy

It is the policy of the United States to provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing throughout the United States.

§3602. Definitions

As used in this subchapter . . .

 (c) “Family” includes a single individual. .. .

 (h) “Handicap” means, with respect to a person—

 (1) a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person’s major life activities,

 (2) a record of having such an impairment, or

 (3) being regarded as having such an impairment, but such term does not include current, illegal use of or addiction to a controlled substance (as defined in section 802 of title 21). . . .

 (k) “Familial status” means one or more individuals (who have not attained the age of 18 years) being domiciled with—

 (1) a parent or another person having legal custody of such individual or individuals; or

 (2) the designee of such parent or other person having such custody, with the written permission of such parent or other person.

The protections afforded against discrimination on the basis of familial status shall apply to any person who is pregnant or is in the process of securing legal custody of any individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

The definition of “familial status” surprises many students. Whom, exactly, does it protect? Unmarried people? Single mothers? Although more intuitive, the definition of handicap has generated a number of legal disputes. Alcohol, for example, is not a controlled substance under section 802 of title 21. Does that mean that a landlord cannot refuse to rent to a person who drinks heavily or sounds very drunk (and belligerent) over the phone?

The real meat of the Fair Housing act comes in §3604. The first subsection makes it unlawful to “refuse to sell or rent . . . or otherwise make unavailable” a “dwelling” to any person because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, or national origin. *See* 42 U.S.C. §3604(a). Later sections provide similar protections for the handicapped. The Act then takes a number of additional steps designed to eliminate discrimination from the housing market. Under the terms of the law it is illegal to:

1. discriminate in the terms or conditions of a sale or rental [§3604(b)];
2. create or publish an advertisement or statement that express a preference or hostility toward individuals in any of the protected categories [§3604(c)];
3. lie about or misrepresent the availability of housing [§3604(d)];
4. refuse to permit handicapped tenants from making reasonable modifications of the existing premise at their own expense [§3604(f)(3)(A)];
5. refuse to make reasonable accommodations in rules and policies to accommodate individuals with handicaps [§3604(f)(3)(B)];
6. Harass or intimidate persons in their enjoyment of a dwelling [§3617].

Unlike the Civil Rights Act of 1866, the Fair Housing Act does contain a number of important exemptions. Section 3607(b), for example, allows housing designated for older persons to bar families with young children. Similarly, section 3607(a) allows religious organizations and private clubs to give preferences to their own members. The most controversial exemption, reproduced below, is the so-called Mrs. Murphy exemption:

(b) Nothing in section 3604 of this title (other than subsection (c)) shall apply to—

(1) any single-family house sold or rented by an owner: Provided, That such private individual owner does not own more than three such single-family houses at any one time: Provided further , That in the case of the sale of any such single-family house by a private individual owner not residing in such house at the time of such sale or who was not the most recent resident of such house prior to such sale, the exemption granted by this subsection shall apply only with respect to one such sale within any twenty-four month period: Provided further , That such bona fide private individual owner does not own any interest in, nor is there owned or reserved on his behalf, under any express or voluntary agreement, title to or any right to all or a portion of the proceeds from the sale or rental of, more than three such single-family houses at any one time: Provided further , That after December 31, 1969, the sale or rental of any such single-family house shall be excepted from the application of this subchapter only if such house is sold or rented (A) without the use in any manner of the sales or rental facilities or the sales or rental services of any real estate broker, agent, or salesman, or of such facilities or services of any person in the business of selling or renting dwellings, or of any employee or agent of any such broker, agent, salesman, or person and (B) without the publication, posting or mailing, after notice, of any advertisement or written notice in violation of section 3604(c) of this title; but nothing in this proviso shall prohibit the use of attorneys, escrow agents, abstractors, title companies, and other such professional assistance as necessary to perfect or transfer the title, or

(2) rooms or units in dwellings containing living quarters occupied or intended to be occupied by no more than four families living independently of each other, if the owner actually maintains and occupies one of such living quarters as his residence.

What does this exemption allow? If the act is intended to root out pernicious discrimination, why include this provision?

It is crucial to note that the plain text of the Mrs. Murphy exemption states that it does not apply to 3604(c)—the subsection that prohibits discriminatory advertising. Thus, although certain categories of landlords are exempted from the statute’s basic framework, they are still not allowed to post discriminatory advertisements.

State Anti-Discrimination Efforts

Some state legislatures have passed laws that afford far more protection from discrimination than the federal statutes provide. Minnesota, for example, protects against housing discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, and source of income. Other states in the Northeast and West Coast provide similar coverage, but these positions are in no way a majority. As the map below indicates, in most states nothing prevents a landlord from denying an apartment to an engaged heterosexual couple, based on the belief that cohabitation before marriage is sinful.



Proving Discrimination

Two broad categories of cases may be brought under the FHA: disparate treatment claims and disparate impact claims.

**

A sign erected by white homeowners trying to prevent black tenants from

moving into their Detroit neighborhood (1942).

*Disparate treatment* claims target intentional forms of discrimination, including the refusal to rent based on one of the protected categories. A plaintiff can show intent to discriminate with “smoking gun” style evidence, such as statements by the landlord that he “would never rent to an Irishman.” Of course, modern landlords rarely make such forthright admissions. As a result, courts in the United States have established a burden-shifting approach that allows plaintiffs to prove intentional discrimination with indirect circumstantial evidence. The initial burden is on the plaintiff to make a *prima facie* case of discrimination. In a refusal to rent case, the plaintiff must show that (1) that she is a member of a class protected by the FHA; (2) that she applied for and was qualified to rent the unit; (3) that she was rejected; and (4) the unit remained unrented. Once the plaintiff has established sufficient evidence to state a *prima facie* case, the burden shifts to the defendant landlord to proffer a legitimate nondiscriminatory reason for the refusal to rent. If the defendant meets this requirement, the burden then shifts back to the tenant to prove that the reason offered is a pretext.

Discrimination is often ferreted out through the use of “testers.” Advocacy groups, many of which are funded by the federal government, will send comparable white and black individuals to inquire about renting a vacant unit. If the landlord treats the testers differently (e.g., provides different levels of assistance, shows different units, provides different information about unit availability) this provides persuasive evidence of illegal discrimination.

*Disparate impact* claims allege that some seemingly neutral policy has a disproportionately harmful effect on members of a group protected by the FHA. These cases rely heavily on statistical evidence and employ a very similar burden-shifting methodology as the disparate treatment claims. Using statistics, plaintiffs need to show that a defendant’s policy has actually caused some disparity. The defendant then has the opportunity to escape liability if it can show show that its actions are necessary to achieve a valid goal. See *Texas Department of Housing & Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc*., 135 S. Ct. 2507 (2015).

Problems

1. William Neithamer, who is gay and HIV positive attempted to rent an apartment from Brenneman Properties. Neithamer did not reveal his HIV status, but admitted to the property manager that he had dismal credit because he had recently devoted all of his resources to taking care of a lover who had died of AIDS. Neithamer, however, offered to pre-pay one year’s rent. Brenneman Properties rejected Neithamer’s application and, in turn, Neithamer sued under the FHA. Does he have a case? *See* *Neithamer v. Brenneman Property Services, Inc.*, 81 F. Supp 2d 1 (D.D.C. 1999).
2. Over the phone, Landlord said to Plaintiff, “Do you have children? I don’t want any little boys because they’ll mess up the house and nobody would be here to watch them. Really, this house isn’t good for kids because it’s right next to a main road.” Plaintiff sues. Landlord argues that her statements only show that she is concerned about the welfare of children. Is that a legitimate non-discriminatory reason to refuse to rent?
3. A local government has decided to knock down two high-rise public housing projects within its borders. The high-rises primarily house recent immigrants from Guatemala. A local advocacy group brings a lawsuit on their behalf, claiming that the government action has a disparate impact on a protected group. Is this a disparate treatment or disparate impact case? Can you think of a non-discriminatory reason why the government may have taken such an action?
4. The FHA requires landlords to make “reasonable accommodations” for individuals with handicaps. Which of the following requests by a tenant would qualify as a reasonable accommodation? (a) Asking a landlord with a first-come/first-served parking policy to create a reserved parking space for a tenant who has difficulty walking; (b) Requesting that a landlord waive parking fees for a disabled tenant’s home health care aide; (c) Asking the landlord to make an exception to the building’s “no pets” rule for a tenant with a service animal; (d) Requesting landlord to pay for a sign language interpreter for a deaf individual during the application process; (e) Asking the landlord to provide oral reminders to pay the rent for a tenant with documented short-term memory loss.

 An Exercise in Advertising

Imagine that you are a lawyer for a newspaper in a large metropolitan area. The local chapter of the ACLU has raised concerns that some advertisements in the classifieds section of your paper violate the Fair Housing Act.[[1]](#footnote-1) Your boss has asked you to review the ads for any offending language. Which of the following would you feel comfortable printing?[[2]](#footnote-2)



What about this ad for a roommate on Craigslist? Is it objectionable to you? Does it violate the FHA? Does it matter that the poster is looking for a *roommate*? Would your answers change if the advertisement read, “Have a room available for an able-bodied white man with no children?”



Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommate.com, LLC

666 F.3d 1216 (9th Cir. 2012)

KOZINSKI, Chief Judge:

There’s no place like home. In the privacy of your own home, you can take off your coat, kick off your shoes, let your guard down and be completely yourself. While we usually share our homes only with friends and family, sometimes we need to take in a stranger to help pay the rent. When that happens, can the government limit whom we choose? Specifically, do the anti-discrimination provisions of the Fair Housing Act (“FHA”) extend to the selection of roommates?

Roommate.com, LLC (“Roommate”) operates an internet-based business that helps roommates find each other. Roommate’s website receives over 40,000 visits a day and roughly a million new postings for roommates are created each year. When users sign up, they must create a profile by answering a series of questions about their sex, sexual orientation and whether children will be living with them. An open-ended “Additional Comments” section lets users include information not prompted by the questionnaire. Users are asked to list their preferences for roommate characteristics, including sex, sexual orientation and familial status. Based on the profiles and preferences, Roommate matches users and provides them a list of housing-seekers or available rooms meeting their criteria. Users can also search available listings based on roommate characteristics, including sex, sexual orientation and familial status. The Fair Housing Councils of San Fernando Valley and San Diego (“FHCs”) sued Roommate in federal court, alleging that the website’s questions requiring disclosure of sex, sexual orientation and familial status, and its sorting, steering and matching of users based on those characteristics, violate the Fair Housing Act (“FHA”), 42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq. . . .

Analysis

If the FHA extends to shared living situations, it’s quite clear that what Roommate does amounts to a violation. The pivotal question is whether the FHA applies to roommates.

I

The FHA prohibits discrimination on the basis of “race, color, religion, sex, familial status, or national origin” in the “sale or rental *of a dwelling*.” 42 U.S.C. § 3604(b) (emphasis added). The FHA also makes it illegal to:

make, print, or publish, or cause to be made, printed, or published any notice, statement, or advertisement, with respect to the sale or rental *of a dwelling* that indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin, or an intention to make any such preference, limitation, or discrimination.

Id. § 3604(c) (emphasis added). The reach of the statute turns on the meaning of “dwelling.”

The FHA defines “dwelling” as “any building, structure, or portion thereof which is occupied as, or designed or intended for occupancy as, a residence by one or more families.” Id. § 3602(b). A dwelling is thus a living unit designed or intended for occupancy by a family, meaning that it ordinarily has the elements generally associated with a family residence: sleeping spaces, bathroom and kitchen facilities, and common areas, such as living rooms, dens and hallways.

It would be difficult, though not impossible, to divide a single-family house or apartment into separate “dwellings” for purposes of the statute. Is a “dwelling” a bedroom plus a right to access common areas? What if roommates share a bedroom? Could a “dwelling” be a bottom bunk and half an armoire? It makes practical sense to interpret “dwelling” as an independent living unit and stop the FHA at the front door.

 There’s no indication that Congress intended to interfere with personal relationships inside the home. Congress wanted to address the problem of landlords discriminating in the sale and rental of housing, which deprived protected classes of housing opportunities. But a business transaction between a tenant and landlord is quite different from an arrangement between two people sharing the same living space. We seriously doubt Congress meant the FHA to apply to the latter. Consider, for example, the FHA’s prohibition against sex discrimination. Could Congress, in the 1960s, really have meant that women must accept men as roommates? Telling women they may not lawfully exclude men from the list of acceptable roommates would be controversial today; it would have been scandalous in the 1960s.

While it’s possible to read dwelling to mean sub-parts of a home or an apartment, doing so leads to awkward results. . . . Nonetheless, this interpretation is not wholly implausible and we would normally consider adopting it, given that the FHA is a remedial statute that we construe broadly. Therefore, we turn to constitutional concerns, which provide strong countervailing considerations.

II

The Supreme Court has recognized that “the freedom to enter into and carry on certain intimate or private relationships is a fundamental element of liberty protected by the Bill of Rights.” *Bd. of Dirs. of Rotary Int’l v. Rotary Club of Duarte*, 481 U.S. 537 (1987). “[C]hoices to enter into and maintain certain intimate human relationships must be secured against undue intrusion by the State because of the role of such relationships in safeguarding the individual freedom that is central to our constitutional scheme.” *Roberts v. U.S. Jaycees*, 468 U.S. 609, 617-18 (1984). Courts have extended the right of intimate association to marriage, child bearing, child rearing and cohabitation with relatives. *Id.* While the right protects only “highly personal relationships,” *IDK, Inc. v. Clark Cnty.*, 836 F.2d 1185, 1193 (9th Cir. 1988) (quoting *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 618), the right isn’t restricted exclusively to family, *Bd. of Dirs. of Rotary Int’l*, 481 U.S. at 545. The right to association also implies a right not to associate. *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 623.

To determine whether a particular relationship is protected by the right to intimate association we look to “size, purpose, selectivity, and whether others are excluded from critical aspects of the relationship.” *Bd. of Dirs. of Rotary Int’l*, 481 U.S. at 546. The roommate relationship easily qualifies: People generally have very few roommates; they are selective in choosing roommates; and non-roommates are excluded from the critical aspects of the relationship, such as using the living spaces. Aside from immediate family or a romantic partner, it’s hard to imagine a relationship more intimate than that between roommates, who share living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, bathrooms, even bedrooms.

Because of a roommate’s unfettered access to the home, choosing a roommate implicates significant privacy and safety considerations. The home is the center of our private lives. Roommates note our comings and goings, observe whom we bring back at night, hear what songs we sing in the shower, see us in various stages of undress and learn intimate details most of us prefer to keep private. . . .

Equally important, we are fully exposed to a roommate’s belongings, activities, habits, proclivities and way of life. This could include matter we find offensive (pornography, religious materials, political propaganda); dangerous (tobacco, drugs, firearms); annoying (jazz, perfume, frequent overnight visitors, furry pets); habits that are incompatible with our lifestyle (early risers, messy cooks, bathroom hogs, clothing borrowers). When you invite others to share your living quarters, you risk becoming a suspect in whatever illegal activities they engage in.

Government regulation of an individual’s ability to pick a roommate thus intrudes into the home, which “is entitled to special protection as the center of the private lives of our people.” Minnesota v. Carter, 525 U.S. 83, 99 (1998) (Kennedy, J., concurring). . . . Holding that the FHA applies inside a home or apartment would allow the government to restrict our ability to choose roommates compatible with our lifestyles. This would be a serious invasion of privacy, autonomy and security.

For example, women will often look for female roommates because of modesty or security concerns. As roommates often share bathrooms and common areas, a girl may not want to walk around in her towel in front of a boy. She might also worry about unwanted sexual advances or becoming romantically involved with someone she must count on to pay the rent.

An orthodox Jew may want a roommate with similar beliefs and dietary restrictions, so he won’t have to worry about finding honey-baked ham in the refrigerator next to the potato latkes. Non-Jewish roommates may not understand or faithfully follow all of the culinary rules, like the use of different silverware for dairy and meat products, or the prohibition against warming non-kosher food in a kosher microwave. . . .

It’s a “well-established principle that statutes will be interpreted to avoid constitutional difficulties.” Frisby v. Schultz, 487 U.S. 474, 483 (1988). “[W]here an otherwise acceptable construction of a statute would raise serious constitutional problems, the Court will construe the statute to avoid such problems unless such construction is plainly contrary to the intent of Congress.” *Pub. Citizen v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 491 U.S. 440, 466 (1989). Because the FHA can reasonably be read either to include or exclude shared living arrangements, we can and must choose the construction that avoids raising constitutional concerns. . . . Reading “dwelling” to mean an independent housing unit is a fair interpretation of the text and consistent with congressional intent. Because the construction of “dwelling” to include shared living units raises substantial constitutional concerns, we adopt the narrower construction that excludes roommate selection from the reach of the FHA. . . .

As the underlying conduct is not unlawful, Roommate’s facilitation of discriminatory roommate searches does not violate the FHA.

Notes and Questions

1. **What’s a dwelling?** The FHA defines “dwelling” as “any building, structure, or portion thereof which is occupied as, or designed or intended for occupancy as, a residence by one or more families.” Id. § 3602(b). Do you think the FHA applies to college dormitories? Is it illegal to reserve some dormitories for women or to have ethnic-themed dorms?
2. **A broader Craigslist problem.** It’s not unusual to stumble across advertisements for apartments (as opposed to just roommate ads) on Craigslist that violate the FHA. If a local newspaper published similar ads they would be liable under the FHA for publishing discriminatory material. Why doesn’t anyone sue Craigslist? The answer is that section 230(c) of the Communications Decency Act provides internet service providers and website owners with broad immunity from liability for content posted by third parties. Craigslist and other similar sites may voluntarily remove offending posts, but they are not required to do so.
1. Would any of these ads violate the Civil Rights Act of 1866? [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The government does provide some guidance to landlords worried about triggering FHA liability through their advertisements. There are, for example, published lists of “words to avoid” and “acceptable language.” Although context is important, landlords can generally use these phrases: good neighborhood, secluded setting, single family home, quality construction, near public transportation, near places of worship, and assistance animals only. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)