



City of
Mountain View

HOUSING DEPARTMENT
RENT STABILIZATION DIVISION
298 Escuela Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94040
650-903-6136 | MountainView.gov/RentStabilization

APPEAL OF PETITION HEARING DECISION

Communications and submissions during the COVID-19 Pandemic: To the extent practicable, all communications, submissions and notices shall be sent via email or other electronic means.

Recently, you received a Hearing Officer Decision for a Petition for Adjustment in Rent. If you disagree with the outcome(s) of the decision, you can request an Appeal Hearing before the Rental Housing Committee. Any Party to a petition may file an appeal of the Decision by *serving a written Request for Appeal on all applicable parties and then filing a copy of the completed form with the Rent Stabilization Division within **fifteen (15) calendar days** after the mailing of the Petition Decision.* If no Appeals are filed within fifteen (15) calendar days, the decision is final.

Please contact our office at 650-903-6136 if you have any questions or for more information about the appeal process. Please review the attached Appeal Information Sheet to learn more.

I hereby Appeal the Hearing Officer's Decision for the following Petition to the Rental Housing Committee:

Petition Case Number: C24250036 and C24250037

Name of Hearing Officer: Renee Glover Chantler Decision Date: 9/5/2025

For the following Property Address, including Unit Number(s), if applicable:

247 Andsbury Ave, Apt [REDACTED] Mountain View, CA 94043

(Street Number)

(Street Name)

(Unit Number)

Person Appealing the Hearing Officer Decision (if more than one person is appealing the petition decision, attach their contact information as applicable):

Name: The Satyavarpu Family Trust

Phone: [REDACTED]

Mailing Address: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

I am: ☐ A tenant affected by this petition.



A landlord affected by this petition.

Instructions:

Please complete the information as requested on page 2. Once you have completed this form and attached all relevant documents, **serve copies on all parties to the petition.** Once served, please file a copy of the form with the Rent Stabilization Division via email (preferred method) to mvrent@mountainview.gov or by mailing to 298 Escuela Ave., Mountain View, CA 94040.

Declaration:

I (we) declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing and all attached pages, including documentation, are true, correct, and complete.

Signature:

Srini Satyavarpu

Digitally signed by Srini Satyavarpu
Date: 2025.09.19 08:54:42 -07'00'

Date: 9/19/2025

Print Name:

Srinivas Satyavarpu

Este formulario está disponible en español y mandarín. | 本表有西班牙语和中文版。

DISCLAIMER: Neither the Rental Housing Committee nor the City of Mountain View make any claims regarding the adequacy, validity, or legality of this document under State or Federal law. This document is not intended to provide legal advice. Please visit mountainview.gov/rentstabilization or call 650-903-6136 for further information.

Appeal Request Instructions and Examples:

The Hearing Officer Decision states specific claims and requests a rent adjustment based on those claims. For each part of the decision you dispute, clearly state each claim that you are appealing and the legal basis for the appeal. *You can only appeal the matters addressed in the decision. You may submit arguments to support your appeal and refer to the evidence in the record to support your arguments but new evidence that was not previously submitted as part of the hearing record will not be accepted. To clarify, no new documentation, or evidence will be accepted or considered by the Committee upon appeal.*

Appeal Examples by Petition Type

The below provide examples of appeal claims. Each decision presents unique facts and the appeal request for your particular decision must only address the outcomes that are in the decision. Any portion of the hearing officer decision that you do not appeal will be considered final unless appealed by another party to the decision.

Appeal Request Example 1: *The hearing officer erred in finding that the rent violated the legally allowed rent because the hearing officer failed to consider proper rent increase notices that were included in the hearing record that were given consistent with the annual general adjustments.*

Appeal Request Example 2: *The hearing officer erred in finding that the landlord was not entitled to an upward adjustment of rent because the hearing officer failed to include in the calculation of Petition Year Operating Expenses valid operating expenses, evidence of which was submitted as part of the Petition and included in the hearing record, including specifically the failure to include self-performed labor expenses and management expenses.*

Appeal Request Example 3: *The hearing officer erred in finding that the tenant was entitled to a reduction in rent for a decrease in housing services resulting from tenant's parking space being unavailable because the hearing officer failed to consider evidence submitted by the landlord showing that an alternative parking space was made available to the tenant.*

Reasons (Claims) for Appeal:

Please use the space below to clearly identify what issue and part of the Decision is the subject of the appeal (include section headings and subheadings, as necessary and reference to relevant evidence). Thoroughly explain the grounds for the appeal. For each issue you are appealing, provide the legal basis why the Rental Housing Committee should modify, reverse, or remand the Hearing Officer's Decision. *(Continue on the next page; add additional pages if needed.)*

Please see attached.

Reasons (Claims) for Appeal (Continued):

Please use the space below to clearly identify what issue and part of the Decision is the subject of the appeal (include section headings and subheadings, as necessary). Thoroughly explain the grounds for the appeal. For each issue you are appealing, provide the legal basis why the Rental Housing Committee should modify, reverse, or remand the Hearing Officer's Decision. *(Continue on the next page; add additional pages if needed.)*

Proof of Service of Request for Appeal of Petition Hearing Decision

I declare that I am over eighteen years of age, and that I served one copy of the attached Appeal of Petition Hearing Decision after Remand on the affected party(ies) listed below by:

☐

Personal Service

Delivering the documents in person on the 19 day of September, 2025, at the address(es) or location(s) above to the following individual(s).

☐

Mail

Placing the documents, enclosed in a sealed envelope with First-Class Postage fully paid, into a U.S. Postal Service Mailbox on the 19 day of September, 2025, addressed as follows to the following individual(s).

☒

Email

Emailing the documents on the 19 day of September, 2025, at the email address(es) as follows to the following individual(s).

Respondents

INSERT RESPONDENT NAME - Srinivas Satyavarpu

INSERT RESPONDENT ADDRESS - [REDACTED]

INSERT RESPONDENT EMAIL - [REDACTED]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct:

Executed on this 19 day of September, 2025

Signature: [Signature]

Print Name: Srinivas Satyavarpu

Address: [REDACTED]



APELACIÓN DE LA DECISIÓN DE LA AUDIENCIA DE PETICIÓN

Comunicaciones y envíos durante la pandemia COVID-19: En la medida de lo posible, todas las comunicaciones, presentaciones y notificaciones se enviarán por correo electrónico u otros medios electrónicos.

Recientemente ha recibido una decisión del Oficial de Audiencia sobre una petición de revisión de la renta. Si no está de acuerdo con los resultados de la decisión, puede solicitar una audiencia de apelación ante el Comité de Viviendas de Renta. Cualquiera de las partes de una petición puede presentar un recurso contra la decisión *presentando una solicitud de apelación por escrito a todas las partes interesadas y, a continuación, presentando una copia del formulario cumplimentado ante la División de Estabilización de Renta* en el plazo de **quince (15) días** naturales a partir del envío por correo de la decisión sobre la petición. Si no se presenta ningún recurso en el plazo de quince (15) días naturales, la decisión será definitiva. Póngase en contacto con nuestra oficina en el 650-903-6136 si tiene alguna pregunta o para obtener más información sobre el proceso de apelación. Por favor, revise la hoja de información de apelación adjunta para obtener más información.

Por la presente, apelo la decisión del Oficial de Audiencia sobre la siguiente petición ante el Comité de Viviendas de Renta:

Número de caso de la petición: C24250036 and C24250037

Nombre del Oficial de Audiencia: Renee Glover Chantler Fecha de la decisión: 9/5/2025

Para la siguiente dirección de propiedad, incluidos los números de unidad, si procede:

247 Andsbury Ave, Apt [REDACTED] Mountain View, CA 94043

(Número de la calle)

(Nombre de la calle)

(Número de la unidad)

Persona que recurre la decisión del Oficial de Audiencia (si hay más de una persona que recurre la decisión de la petición, adjunte su información de contacto según proceda):

Nombre: The Satyavarpu Family Trust

Teléfono: [REDACTED]

Dirección postal: [REDACTED]

Correo electrónico: [REDACTED]

Yo soy: ☐ Un inquilino afectado por esta petición. ☒ Un propietario afectado por esta petición.

Instrucciones:

Rellene la información solicitada en la página 2. Una vez que haya rellenado este formulario y adjuntado todos los documentos pertinentes, **entregue copias a todas las partes de la petición**. Una vez enviadas, presente una copia del formulario a la División de Estabilización de Renta por correo electrónico (método preferido) a mvrent@mountainview.gov o por correo postal a 298 Escuela Ave., Mountain View, CA 94040.

Declaración:

Declaro (declaramos) bajo pena de perjurio en virtud de las leyes del Estado de California que todo lo anterior y todas las páginas adjuntas, incluida la documentación, son verdaderos, correctos y completos.

Firma:

Fecha: 9/19/2025

Nombre en letra de imprenta: Srinivas Satyavarpu

This form is available in English and Mandarin. | 本表有英文版和普通话版。

DESCARGO DE RESPONSABILIDAD: Ni el Comité de Viviendas de Renta ni la Ciudad de Mountain View hacen ninguna afirmación con respecto a la idoneidad, validez o legalidad de este documento en virtud de la ley estatal o federal. Este documento no pretende proporcionar asesoramiento jurídico. Por favor visite mountainview.gov/rentstabilization o llame al 650-903-6136 para obtener más información.

Instrucciones y ejemplos de solicitud de recurso:

La decisión del Oficial de Audiencia expone reclamaciones específicas y solicita un ajuste de la renta basado en dichas reclamaciones. Para cada parte de la decisión que impugne, indique claramente cada reclamación que recurre y el fundamento jurídico del recurso. *Sólo puede recurrir las cuestiones abordadas en la decisión. Puede presentar argumentos en apoyo de su recurso y remitirse a las pruebas que consten en el expediente para respaldar sus argumentos, pero no se aceptarán nuevas pruebas que no se hayan presentado previamente como parte del expediente de la audiencia. A modo de aclaración, el Comité no aceptará ni tendrá en cuenta nueva documentación o pruebas en caso de recurso.*

Ejemplos de recursos por tipo de petición

A continuación se ofrecen ejemplos de solicitudes de apelación. Cada decisión presenta hechos únicos y la solicitud de apelación para su decisión en particular debe abordar únicamente los resultados que figuran en la decisión. Cualquier parte de la decisión del Oficial de Audiencia que usted no apele se considerará definitiva a menos que sea apelada por otra de las partes de la decisión.

Ejemplo 1 de solicitud de apelación: El Oficial de Audiencia incurrió en error al declarar que la renta infringía la renta legalmente permitida porque el Oficial de Audiencia no tuvo en cuenta las notificaciones adecuadas de aumento de la renta que se incluyeron en el expediente de la vista y que se entregaron en consonancia con los ajustes generales anuales.

Ejemplo 2 de solicitud de apelación: El Oficial de Audiencia incurrió en error al declarar que el propietario no tenía derecho a un ajuste al alza de la renta porque el Oficial de Audiencia no incluyó en el cálculo de los gastos de operación del año de la petición los gastos de operación válidos, cuyas pruebas se presentaron como parte de la petición y se incluyeron en el expediente de la vista, incluyendo específicamente la no inclusión de los gastos de mano de obra propia y los gastos de gestión.

Ejemplo 3 de solicitud de apelación: El Oficial de Audiencia incurrió en un error al declarar que el inquilino tenía derecho a una reducción de la renta por una disminución de los servicios de vivienda derivada de la indisponibilidad de la plaza de estacionamiento del inquilino, porque el Oficial de Audiencia no tuvo en cuenta las pruebas presentadas por el propietario que demostraban que se había puesto a disposición del inquilino una plaza de estacionamiento alternativa.

Motivos (alegaciones) de la apelación:

Utilice el espacio que figura a continuación para identificar claramente qué cuestión y qué parte de la decisión es objeto del recurso (incluya los epígrafes y subepígrafes de las secciones, según sea necesario, y la referencia a las pruebas pertinentes). Explique detalladamente los motivos del recurso. Para cada cuestión que recurra, indique el fundamento jurídico por el que el Comité de Viviendas de Renta debe modificar, revocar o devolver la decisión del Oficial de Audiencia. *(Continúe en la página siguiente; añada páginas adicionales si es necesario).*

Motivos (alegaciones) de la apelación (continuación):

Utilice el espacio que figura a continuación para identificar claramente qué cuestión y qué parte de la decisión es objeto del recurso (incluya títulos y subtítulos de sección, según sea necesario). Explique detalladamente los motivos del recurso. Para cada cuestión que recurra, indique el fundamento jurídico por el que el Comité de Viviendas de Renta debe modificar, revocar o devolver la decisión del Oficial de Audiencia. *(Continúe en la página siguiente; añada páginas adicionales si es necesario).*

Prueba de entrega de la solicitud de apelación de la audiencia de la petición

Declaro que soy mayor de dieciocho años y que he entregado una copia del recurso de apelación de la decisión de la audiencia de la petición tras la devolución que está adjunta al **parte(s) afectada(s) enumerada(s) a continuación por:**

☐

Servicio personal

Entregando los documentos en persona el día 19 de September, 2025, en la(s) dirección(es) o lugar(es arriba indicado(s) a la(s) siguiente(s) persona(s).

☐

Correo

Depositando los documentos, en un sobre cerrado con franqueo de primera clase totalmente pagado, en un buzón del Servicio de Correos de los EE.UU. situado en la calle _____ el día 19 de September, 2025, dirigido a la(s) siguiente(s) persona(s).

☒

Correo electrónico

Enviando por correo electrónico los documentos el día 19 de September, 2025, a través de la(s) siguiente(s) dirección(es) de correo electrónico de la(s) siguiente(s) persona(s).

Parte demandada

INSERT RESPONDENT NAME - Srinivas Satyavarpu

INSERT RESPONDENT ADDRESS - [REDACTED]

INSERT RESPONDENT EMAIL - [REDACTED]

Declaro bajo pena de perjurio con arreglo a las leyes del Estado de California que lo anterior es cierto y correcto:

Realizado en este día 19 de September, 2025

Firma: _____

Nombre: Srinivas Satyavarpu

Dirección: [REDACTED]

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW - RENTAL HOUSING COMMITTEE

In re: 247 Andsbury Avenue, Unit ■ Mountain View, CA

Case Nos.: C24250036 & C24250037

REQUEST FOR APPEAL OF PETITION HEARING DECISION

On Behalf of Respondent: The Satyavarpu Family Trust

Date: - 19th September, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Article XVII of the City Charter, the Community Stabilization and Fair Rent Act ("CSFRA"), and applicable Rent Stabilization Regulations, Respondent, the **Satyavarpu Family Trust** ("Respondent"), respectfully appeals the Hearing Officer's *Decision After Hearing* dated September 5th, 2025.

While Respondent acknowledges certain findings, the Decision contains legal and factual inconsistencies, fails to properly account for Respondent's good-faith compliance efforts, and imposes excessive monetary liability disproportionate to both the evidence and the comparative fault acknowledged in the ruling itself.

GROUND FOR APPEAL

I. The Hearing Officer is factually correct in Calculating Rent Overcharges.

Respondent hereby acknowledges an incomplete understanding of the Community Stabilization and Fair Rent Act ("CSFRA") and its specific requirements. Acting in our capacity as Trustees and representatives of the Satyavarpu Family Trust, we accept responsibility for the rent increases applied to the Garcia family. Respondent respectfully extends its apologies for this oversight and affirms its intent to fully comply with the Hearing Officer's ruling by reimbursing the tenants in full as directed.

II. The Decision Imposes Duplicative and Excessive Rent Rebates for Pest Infestations Despite Evidence of Continuous Professional Treatment.

The Respondent respectfully requests that the Committee reconsider the Hearing Officer's finding assigning 30% fault to the Respondent for the cockroach infestation at 247 Andsbury Avenue, Unit ■. The decision contains a factual inconsistency that undermines the validity of its conclusion.

Respondent engaged Budget Pest Control in July 2023 followed by and hired **Clark Pest Control** under contract beginning in August 2023, as well as an updated year-round commercial pest away agreement in Jan 2024 and subsequently increased the frequency of interior treatments to monthly. Evidence showed consistent, professional remediation efforts undertaken in good faith.

Furthermore, the Hearing Officer wrote that the infestation “began in early 2022, prior to Respondent’s purchase of the Unit.” Despite this, the decision attribute’s partial fault to the Respondent based on remodeling work performed in early and late 2023 namely, the installation of new countertops and a stove. This timeline renders the causal link untenable: it is factually impossible for construction activities undertaken in 2023 to have initiated or “fueled” an infestation that was already active in early 2022.

Moreover, the decision acknowledges that the infestation originated in areas “not reasonably accessible to the tenant,” such as crevices between the stove and countertops. While the Respondent accepts responsibility for ensuring that such areas are properly sealed during remodeling, this obligation does not retroactively extend to conditions predating ownership. The mere existence of a gap or crevice does not constitute a habitability violation unless it is shown to be the proximate cause of the infestation, something the decision fails to establish. The only consistent factor throughout the relevant infestation period is the tenant’s occupancy and sanitation practices, not any remodeling or pest control. The infestation persisted prior to, during, and after the remodeling, and the decision does not identify any affirmative act or omission by the Respondent that directly contributed to the presence of cockroaches. In fact, the decision explicitly states that “Respondent has not shown that a lack of sanitation at the Unit was the cause of the infestation,” yet fails to reconcile this with the tenant’s exclusive control over daily cleanliness and food storage.

The Respondent therefore asserts that the assignment of 30% fault is unsupported by the record and constitutes clear error. The Committee is urged to vacate this portion of the decision and find that the Respondent bears no liability for the cockroach infestation.

III. The Decision Imposes Duplicative and Excessive Rent Rebates for Rat Infestations

The Respondent respectfully requests reconsideration of the decision assigning greater liability for the rat infestation at the subject property. While the Respondent acknowledges that electing for a rat exclusion inspection in August 2023 would have been a more comprehensive measure, the service agreement was modified with a new agreement in Jan 2024 where that clause was removed, which was overlooked by the hearing officer. It is important to recognize that timely and reasonable steps were taken in good faith to address the issue. Specifically, the Respondent engaged Clark Pest Control to place traps at the unit, an industry standard response under the circumstances.

The infestation’s primary source was the adjacent community garden, which is located farthest from the affected unit. This environmental factor, outside the Respondent’s control, contributed significantly to the presence of rodents. The Respondent acted promptly upon learning of the issue and relied on professional pest control services to mitigate the problem. While hindsight suggests that a more

aggressive exclusion package may have yielded better results, the actions taken were consistent with reasonable property management practices.

Assigning excessive fault to the Respondent disregards these efforts and creates an inequitable outcome. A complete rebate implies a total failure to maintain the property, which is not supported by the facts. Had the Respondent did not hire Clark pest control or did not set traps, then a 100% fault to the Respondent makes sense, but this is not the case. The Respondent did not ignore the issue, nor delay in responding. Rather, they took action based on the information available at the time and within the scope of standard pest control protocols.

In light of these considerations, the Respondent respectfully requests a partial reduction in the award, reflecting the good-faith efforts made to address the infestation. Such an adjustment would more accurately balance responsibility and recognize the proactive steps taken to maintain habitability.

With respect to the cockroach infestation, the Decision applied comparative responsibility, yet the same analysis was not applied to the rat infestation despite overlapping factual circumstances. The same argument used by the hearing officer to assign fault to the Petitioner (lack of cleanliness, see February 25 Clark Service Report, sent to HO prior to hearing) for the cockroaches equally applies to rats, since it is common knowledge that both rats and cockroaches are attracted to food particles and messes.

V. The Decision Fails to Credit Respondent's Substantial Capital Improvements as Evidence of Good Faith Maintenance.

The record reflects Respondent invested approximately **\$70,000–\$80,000** in upgrades to Unit [REDACTED] including but not limited to new countertops, stainless steel appliances, bathroom remodel, new paint, dual pane windows, doors and flooring.

Such evidence demonstrates Respondent's good faith commitment to habitability and compliance with Civil Code §§ 1941.1 et seq., which should weigh against a finding of prolonged failure to maintain.

By disregarding these improvements in its allocation of liability, the Decision failed to balance statutory obligations with equitable considerations.

RELIEF REQUESTED

For the foregoing reasons, Respondent respectfully requests that the Rental Housing Committee:

1. **Modify the pest (Roaches and Rat) infestation deduction to 5%,** to properly account for Respondent's continuous engagement of professional pest control services and comparative responsibility of Petitioner;
2. **Clarify the conditions for restoration of the lawful rent level,** including clear benchmarks for abatement verification
3. Grant such other relief as is just and proper, especially considering remodel costs.

CONCLUSION

Respondent respectfully submits that the Decision imposes disproportionate penalties despite evidence of compliance, remediation, and good faith property management. The errors in law and fact require modification or reduction of the ordered remedies.

Dated: September 20th, 2025

Respectfully submitted,



Srinivas Satyavaru

On behalf of the Satyavaru Family Trust