

May 27, 2025

Final Investigative Report

Case Name: Allen, Crystal v 2001 Develop LLC et al

Case Number: HUD: 04-25-7674-8 PC:25-006

I. Jurisdiction

PCOHR filed this complaint on November 27, 2024 alleging that the complainant(s) was injured by a discriminatory act. It is alleged that the respondent(s) was responsible for: Discrimination in terms/conditions/privileges relating to rental; and Failure to make reasonable accommodation. It is alleged that the respondent(s)'s acts were based on Disability. The most recent act is alleged to have occurred on November 04, 2024, and is continuing. The property is located at: 2001 2ND ST S, St. Petersburg, FL 33705. The property in question is not exempt under the applicable statutes. If proven, the allegation(s) would constitute a violation of Article II, Division 3 of Chapter 70 of the Code of Ordinances of Pinellas County, Florida and Sections 804(f), and 804(f)(3)(B) of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 as amended by the Fair Housing Act of 1988.

The respondent(s) receive no federal assistance.

II. Parties and Aggrieved Persons

A. Complainant(s)

Crystal Allen
135 N. Tucker Road
Florence, MS 39073

Complainant Representative(s)

Complainant Allegations

Complainant Crystal Allen (CP Allen) belongs to a class of persons whom the Fair Housing Act protects because she is involved in a protected activity. CP Allen was interested in renting a property located at 2001 2nd Street South St. Petersburg, FL 33705. The property is owned and managed by 2001 Develop LLC (RP 2001). She requested a reasonable accommodation for her service animal and her request was denied.

CP Allen was interested in renting the property located at 2001 2nd Street South St. Petersburg, FL 33705. On November 4, 2024, CP Allen scheduled an appointment to view the unit she was interested in renting. She met with a woman (name unknown) who showed her the unit and offered to show another unit in the other side. After viewing the property CP Allen advised her she was interested in renting the unit and asked what she needed to do to move forward with the

application process. The woman contacted a male over the phone and placed him on speakerphone. CP Allen asked questions regarding the properties, and she advised the gentleman (name unknown) that she wanted to proceed. The gentleman asked if CP Allen had pets and she stated she had a service animal and all documentation required to be provided during the application process. CP Allen states the gentleman went over the application and advised her of the application fees, rent fee, pet deposit, and monthly fees. CP Allen advised the gentleman she had a service dog, not a pet. The gentleman advised her that he understood it was a service animal, but he still has to charge the pet fees and pet rent. At this point CP Allen states that the gentleman refused her accommodation and she ended up not renting the unit.

B. Other Aggrieved Persons

C. Respondent(s)

2001 DEVELOP LLC
Registered Agent: David Braun
13801 WALSINGHAM ROAD
A436
A436
Largo, FL 33774

The Grey Roosters, LLC
Registered Agent: David Braun
13801 Walsingham Rd.
A436
Largo, FL 33774

Renan Yared
The Grey Roosters, LLC
13801 WALSINGHAM ROAD
A436
Largo, FL 33774

Respondent Representative(s)

Mitchel D. den Tuinder
Macfarlane Ferguson & McMullen
P.O. Box 1669
Clearwater, FL 33757

Representing: 2001 DEVELOP LLC

Respondent Defenses

Respondent states that they have no records that CP submitted a rental application for the unit in question. Respondent states that while CP may have expressed interest in the unit during her

visit, they have no documentation or records indicating that CP completed the application process or provided the required materials for further consideration.

Respondents state based on discussions with their team, CP may have visited the property and viewed the available unit. However, they do not maintain a log of visitors, as it is not required for property tours, and it is challenging to confirm who visits unless an application is formally submitted. During property tours, their team doesn't discuss general rental policies that are addressed to our office staff.

Respondents state they adhere strictly to the Fair Housing Act and state laws regarding reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities, including those with service animals. Respondents' policy explicitly exempts service animals from pet fees and ensures that requests for reasonable accommodations are addressed promptly and in compliance with the law. Respondents state they currently have tenants in other properties who have service animals, and they have no issues or complaints in accommodating their needs.

Respondents stated the allegations do not align with their practices or policies. Without a formal application or specific documentation from CP, they had no opportunity to evaluate or act upon her request for a reasonable accommodation. If CP had submitted an application and accompanying documentation, they would have promptly reviewed it in accordance with their standard procedure. The claim that they refused CP's accommodation request is not accurate. At no point did Respondent formally deny CP's request because the process of submitting an application and verifying eligibility was never completed.

Respondent states that while they have no record of an application or formal denial of accommodations, they welcome CP to re-engage with them. Respondent encourages CP to visit their office to submit a rental application, provide the necessary documentation for her service animal, and allow them to properly review her application and ensure full compliance with housing laws.

Respondents state that they uphold the FHA and ensure compliance with its provisions. They maintain clear and transparent policies regarding service animals and reasonable accommodations.

D. Witnesses

Alex Silva
The Grey Roosters, LLC

Alyssa Kacprzyk
2001 2nd St. S
B
St. Petersburg, FL 33705

III. Case Summary

A. Interviews

Complainant: Allen, Crystal
Date of Interview: February 20, 2025
Type of Interview: Telephone
Interviewer: Postell, Lisa Ann Marie

Other Witnesses: Kacprzyk, Alyssa
Date of Interview: March 11, 2025
Type of Interview: Telephone
Interviewer: Postell, Lisa Ann Marie

Interviewing Ms. Kacprzyk. She was identified by Respondent as a person living at the property in question with a service animal.

Ms. Kacprzyk stated her address is 2001 2nd St. S #B, St. Petersburg FL.
She stated she has a service animal, a dog (Catahoula mix).
She stated she did not pay a pet deposit or a monthly pet fee for her service animal.
She stated she had the dog when she moved in on December 1, 2024.
She stated she does not know the owners personally.
She found the listing on Zillow and spoke with Grey Roosters David and Raynan(?).
She did not know if the dog was listed on the lease, she did not have it with her.

Respondent: Yared, Renan
Date of Interview: May 15, 2025
Type of Interview: Internet
Interviewer: Postell, Lisa Ann Marie

Other Witnesses: Silva, Alex
Date of Interview: May 15, 2025
Type of Interview: Internet
Interviewer: Postell, Lisa Ann Marie

B. Documents

Nature of Document: 903 Form-Allen-Crystal
Who Provided: Internet
How Transmitted to HUD: Online 903 form
Date of Document: November 11, 2024
Date Obtained: November 11, 2024

Nature of Document: Extension request from Resp
Who Provided: Respondent
How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: December 19, 2024

Date Obtained: December 20, 2024

Respondent requested an extension for position statement.

Nature of Document: Position statement 2001 attachment

Who Provided: Respondent

How Transmitted to HUD: email

Date of Document: January 07, 2025

Date Obtained: January 07, 2025

Position statement 1/7/25 attachment

Nature of Document: Position statement

Who Provided: Respondent

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: January 07, 2025

Date Obtained: January 08, 2025

Respondent states that they have no records that CP submitted a rental application for the unit in question. Respondent states that while CP may have expressed interest in the unit during her visit, they have no documentation or records indicating that CP completed the application process or provided the required materials for further consideration.

Respondents state based on discussions with their team, CP may have visited the property and viewed the available unit. However, they do not maintain a log of visitors, as it is not required for property tours, and it is challenging to confirm who visits unless an application is formally submitted. During property tours, their team doesn't discuss general rental policies that are addressed to our office staff.

Respondents state they adhere strictly to the Fair Housing Act and state laws regarding reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities, including those with service animals. Respondents' policy explicitly exempts service animals from pet fees and ensures that requests for reasonable accommodations are addressed promptly and in compliance with the law. Respondents state they currently have tenants in other properties who have service animals, and they have no issues or complaints in accommodating their needs.

Respondents stated the allegations do not align with their practices or policies. Without a formal application or specific documentation from CP, they had no opportunity to evaluate or act upon her request for a reasonable accommodation. If CP had submitted an application and accompanying documentation, they would have promptly reviewed it in accordance with their standard procedure. The claim that they refused CP's accommodation request is not accurate. At no point did Respondent formally deny CP's request because the process of submitting an application and verifying eligibility was never completed.

Respondent states that while they have no record of an application or formal denial of

accommodations, they welcome CP to re-engage with them. Respondent encourages CP to visit their office to submit a rental application, provide the necessary documentation for her service animal, and allow them to properly review her application and ensure full compliance with housing laws.

Respondents state that they uphold the FHA and ensure compliance with its provisions. They maintain clear and transparent policies regarding service animals and reasonable accommodations.

Nature of Document: RA Disability letter for CP

Who Provided: Complainant

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: January 17, 2025

Date Obtained: January 20, 2025

CP's RA letter stating she is disabled and how her service animal assists her disability.

Nature of Document: Rebuttal

Who Provided: Complainant

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 20, 2025

Date Obtained: January 20, 2025

RFI questions:

1. Did you apply - I did not apply. The man on the phone told me that he would not rent to me if I did not agree to the pet fees and pet deposit. I would not waste the time, money and energy going through the application process when I have already been denied the rental property (and accommodation request) in this way.

2. Any additional information you may have to support your claims of discrimination - The Facebook listing, along with the seller's Facebook information to get more clarity on who I was communicating with on the phone and denied my request. I believe the Facebook profile belongs to the man I spoke to on speaker phone, and the female who was present to show me the properties and called him, was showing the properties on his behalf.

CP provided a Facebook listing for 2001 2nd Ave S. St. Petersburg.

3. Any witness information you may have - The only witness to the incident was the female who showed me the properties. I do not recall her name and I did not have her contact information because I was communicating with the person on Facebook, which appears to be the man I spoke with on speaker phone while the female was present.

Rebuttal:

“The claim that we refused her accommodation request is not accurate. At no point did we formally deny Ms. Allen’s request because the process of submitting an application and verifying eligibility was never completed.” My understanding is that a “formal denial” is not

required under the ADA to be considered refusal of accommodation. And there is no requirement for me to submit an application to be discriminated against. The man was very blunt, rude, and unwilling to listen to me when I was explaining to him that I wanted to move forward with an application without verbally agreeing to pay a pet deposit and pet fees. He dismissed me like I didn't know what I was talking about and said he would not rent to me. Therefore, Respondent refused my accommodation request. Respondent also states, "...it is challenging to confirm who visits unless an application is formally submitted. During property tours, our team doesn't discuss general rental policies that are addressed to our office staff." With the Facebook images I have provided you (and them via this Rebuttal), they can confirm the date/time of my visit and the staff member or owner of the property who refused my request.

Nature of Document: RFI response from CP

Who Provided: Complainant

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: November 04, 2024

Date Obtained: January 22, 2025

CP provided RFI response. The messages from the property listing on FaceBook showing the address, and the messages that they agreed to show the property, the date and time November 4, @1:00 PM. The advertisement is from Nalla Nalla and states 1 Bed 1 Bath Apartment \$1400 2001 2nd St S St. Petersburg FL. Dog and Cat Friendly.

Nature of Document: Respondent Response to RFI

Who Provided: Respondent

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 02, 2025

Date Obtained: February 03, 2025

Respondent responded stating he wished to speak to an attorney stating that what I am asking for is beyond his knowledge of legal requirements.

Nature of Document: RFI Response from Resp Rep

Who Provided: Respondent Representative

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 07, 2025

Date Obtained: February 10, 2025

Provided partial RFI information.

The name and contact information for the person who posted the listing on Facebook under the name Nalla Nalla - Alex Silva with contact information.

The name and contact for the person who showed the unit to CP - Presently do not know who showed the property based off the fact that it is a woman we have narrowed it down to 3 people and the client is asking them. Their first names are Carla, Gislene and Elce. If CP recognizes one of those names it may also help identify the person.

The name and contact information for the person who was called by the above person while CP was at the property - Based off of the fact that she spoke with a man either Renan Yared, David Braun, or Alex Silva.

Provide your reasonable accommodation policy and procedures - They don't have a formal accommodation policy. They use Rocket Lawyer to draft their leases.

Explain your rental process - Grey Roosters Long-Term Rental Process At Grey Roosters, we follow a structured and transparent process to ensure a seamless rental experience while maintaining compliance with fair housing laws and industry best practices. Our process is as follows: Property Advertising We market our long-term rental properties on multiple platforms, including Zillow, Apartments.com, Furnished Finder, and Facebook, to attract qualified tenants. Initial Inquiry & Property Tour When a prospective tenant expresses interest, we respond with an invitation to schedule a property tour, allowing them to view the unit before proceeding with an application. Rental Application Submission If the prospective tenant remains interested and meets our initial leasing criteria, we provide a link to complete a formal rental application. Application Selection & Completion The applicant selects the desired property and submits the completed rental application for review. Screening & Background Check A third-party screening company conducts a comprehensive tenant background check, including: Credit Score Report – Assessing financial responsibility and payment history. Eviction Report – Identifying any prior eviction records. Criminal Background Report – Reviewing any relevant criminal history. Application Review & Approval Each application undergoes a thorough review based on objective, non-discriminatory criteria, including but not limited to: Minimum credit score requirements Verifiable income (typically 2.5 to 3 times the monthly rent) Rental history and references Employment verification No prior evictions or significant rental defaults No disqualifying criminal history If the application meets all criteria, it is approved. If it does not, the applicant is notified accordingly. Lease Agreement Execution Upon approval, the tenant receives the official leasing documents for review and signature. Security Deposit & Tenant Portal Access After signing the lease, the tenant is required to submit the security deposit. Once confirmed, the tenant gains access to the Tenant Portal, where they can securely make payments and manage their lease. Key Handoff & Move-In Coordination Once the lease is signed and the security deposit is received, we coordinate an in-person key handoff, ensuring a smooth transition into the property. Welcome Announcement The new resident receives a formal welcome message, providing essential information about their new home and available support services. This process ensures that all applicants are evaluated fairly and that our properties are leased to responsible tenants while maintaining compliance with all applicable housing regulations.

Number of units at this property - 5 units

Provide number of properties/units owned by David Braun (individually, jointly or under other companies/corporations) - no response given

Provide number of properties/units owned by Renan Yared (individually, jointly or under other

companies/corporations) - no response given

Provide the number of units that have pets and their contact information - 0 at this property.

Provide the number of units that have service animals/emotional support animals and their contact information - One other tenant at this property has a service animal. It was my understanding that accommodation information was confidential so if you can just confirm that doesn't apply because this is a HUD investigation I will provide you with her contact information.

Provide a copy of the lease - copy of lease attached

Nature of Document: RFI response from CP

Who Provided: Complainant

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: February 10, 2025

Date Obtained: February 11, 2025

CP stated the name of the person she believed she dealt with who showed her the property. CP stated the man on the phone had a strong foreign accent.

CP also asked questions regarding the RA verification, sent response.

Requested interview with CP

Nature of Document: Email from Respondent Representative

Who Provided: Respondent Representative

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 18, 2025

Date Obtained: February 18, 2025

Respondent Rep emailed he is trying to get the information from his clients.
Just provided an update.

Nature of Document: Additional information from CP

Who Provided: Complainant

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 26, 2025

Date Obtained: February 27, 2025

Email from CP stating she went by the property, saw cameras, provided pictures of the cameras on the property. Stated there may possibly be footage and audio of her interactions with the person who showed the unit to her.

Nature of Document: Response from Respondent Rep

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 27, 2025

Date Obtained: February 27, 2025

Asked if they have been able to obtain who the person was that CP spoke to. That interviews are needed with Elce and the man Elce called while CP was there. CP could only identify him saying that he had a thick foreign accent that did not sound Hispanic. - Response was Unfortunately have not been able to determine who CP spoke with over the phone. It is his hope Elce will know who she called. Elce has not returned his calls. All three gentlemen who could have received the call have strong accents. Provided a copy of a lease with pet policy

Requested the pet policy as the lease provided did not have a pet policy on it.

Nature of Document: RFI Response from Resp Rep

Who Provided: Respondent Representative

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 27, 2025

Date Obtained: February 27, 2025

Response to an RFI asking for

1. surveillance recordings for November 4 at approximately 1:00 pm. - Checking with his clients.
2. a copy of the lease as it was not attached previously. - lease attached, no pet policy on the lease.

Respondent Rep also provided the name of the person who has a service animal at the location, Alyssa and her contact information.

Nature of Document: RFI to Respondent and response-1

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 11, 2025

Date Obtained: March 11, 2025

Asked to explain the following discrepancies:

1. On the advertisement for the apartment it says, "Dog and Cat friendly" - Respondent Attorney requested a copy of the advertisement - provided.
2. The person on the phone told CP that there was a pet deposit and pet rent she had to agree to.
3. The lease provided stated "No pets, dogs, cats, birds...."

Asked Respondent to provide a current lease, name redacted, to the unit in question, or a unit associated to the address. - Respondent Attorney will inquire.

Asked the current availability at the location. - Respondent Attorney will inquire.

To expedite the case, an interview with the persons CP spoke with by the end of the week. - Respondent Attorney stated regarding the interviewing the people CP spoke with he will reach out to Renan and David about their availability. He has not had any luck reaching out to Elce and gave her contact info.

Nature of Document: CP response to predetermination letter
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: March 18, 2025
Date Obtained: March 18, 2025

CP acknowledged she received predetermination letter.
CP asked about conciliation, responded.
CP was asked why she is alleging Terms and Conditions: CP responded because Respondent refused the necessary accommodation of her service dog under the FHA unless she agreed to pay an additional pet deposit and monthly pet fees. When she told Resp. that she is not required to pay pet deposits and monthly pet fees due to him being her service dog, he said that he would not rent to her unless she agreed to pay them.

CP was asked which unit she viewed, CP stated unit C.

Nature of Document: Predetermination letter to CP
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: March 18, 2025
Date Obtained: March 18, 2025

Predetermination letter sent to CP by email.

Nature of Document: Respondent Attorney predetermination letter response
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: March 18, 2025
Date Obtained: March 18, 2025

Respondent attorney acknowledged receipt of predetermination letter.
Respondent attorney stated he will provide a response by March 24th.

Nature of Document: Predetermination letter to Respondent Attorney
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: March 18, 2025
Date Obtained: March 18, 2025

Predetermination letter sent to Respondent Attorney by email.

Nature of Document: RFI Response from Resp Rep
Who Provided: Respondent Representative
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: March 24, 2025
Date Obtained: March 24, 2025

Respondent's Representative stated he is trying to get additional information from his clients but he sent a copy of Alyssa's lease.

Is asking for a copy of the complaint originally sent to his clients. - sent.

The lease agreement that was signed by Alyssa on 11/25/25 shows that a pet deposit was agreed upon in the amount of \$250.00. The pets clause says no pets allowed on premises. The pet deposit is a separate paragraph in the lease.

Nature of Document: Response to Respondent Rep

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 24, 2025

Date Obtained: March 24, 2025

Sent Respondent Representative a copy of the original complaint as requested.

Told Respondent Rep that due to the age of the case, I will be proceeding with the investigation and writing my determination.

Nature of Document: Amended complaint

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 25, 2025

Date Obtained: March 25, 2025

Amended complaint to add The Grey Roosters, LLC as the property management company.

Unsigned

Nature of Document: Additional information from Respondent

Who Provided: Respondent Representative

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 24, 2025

Date Obtained: March 25, 2025

Respondent provided a declaration from David Braun, the owner of the unit. In this declaration Mr. Braun states, he is the owner of the property in question. The Grey Roosters, LLC manages the property. Talks about the process of renting the units. States to his understanding CP visited the property November 4, 2024. That CP was shown the property by an unknown woman who called an unidentified gentleman who allegedly informed her that she was going to have to pay a pet deposit and pet rent for her service animal. To his knowledge CP never submitted an application for tenancy. References information in a proposal CP submitted. That Grey Roosters has a complaint system in place for processing rental applications and evaluating reasonable accommodation requests. They have never encountered issues with tenants who have service animals.

He acknowledges they are aware of a tenant at the property in questions that has a service animal.

He states without the identity of the individuals CP spoke to Grey Roosters tried to identify the individuals and provided the names of the women to see whether any of them would be familiar to CP. CP was only able to identify the male as having a foreign accent non-Hispanic.

Grey Roosters disputes that the statements CP alleges regarding her service animal were made. Grey Roosters has and does make accommodations for service animals and began renting a unit on the property to an individual less than a month after this alleged discrimination occurred.

The unit was unfurnished.

Respondent also provided the application process.

Complaint amended based on the information that The Grey Roosters, LLC were responsible for the viewing, application and leasing process as the property management.

Nature of Document: Emails with Respondent Representative

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 25, 2025

Date Obtained: March 25, 2025

Emails with Respondent Attorney discussing possibly amending the complaint and if he will receive service for The Grey Roosters, LLC.

Attorney will talk to his client.

After confirming the complaint will be amended, Respondent Attorney asked about possible penalties/fines.

Nature of Document: Amended complaint to CP for signature

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 25, 2025

Date Obtained: March 25, 2025

Email sent to CP with amended complaint for her signature. Added The Grey Roosters, LLC as property management.

Nature of Document: Additional information from Respondent Representative

Who Provided: Respondent Representative

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 25, 2025

Date Obtained: March 25, 2025

Emails confirming The Grey Roosters, LLC are responsible for the showing, applications process and leasing the of the unit at the location for 2001 Develop, LLC. Respondent Attorney responded that is correct. 2001 Develop LLC owns the property, however The Grey Roosters, LLC is the entity that leases and manages the property. He also states that the showing of the property is coordinated by The Grey Roosters but is usually performed by one of the other residents for the multi-family properties.

Nature of Document: Returned mail
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD:
Date of Document: April 07, 2025
Date Obtained: April 07, 2025

Returned certified mail for Respondent 2001 Develop

Nature of Document: Returned mail
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: April 07, 2025
Date Obtained: April 07, 2025

Returned certified mail for Respondent The Grey Roosters

Nature of Document: Email from Respondent Attorney
Who Provided: Respondent
How Transmitted to HUD: email
Date of Document: April 09, 2025
Date Obtained: April 09, 2025

Email from Respondent Attorney stating he received the amended complaint and will confirm with his client if he can accept service.

Nature of Document: Emails with Respondent Attorney
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: email
Date of Document: April 14, 2025
Date Obtained: April 14, 2025

Email from Respondent Attorney requesting an extension for the position statement for Grey Roosters.

Nature of Document: Position statement Roosters attachment
Who Provided: Respondent
How Transmitted to HUD: email
Date of Document: April 21, 2025
Date Obtained: April 21, 2025

Position statement attachment

Nature of Document: Position statement

Who Provided: Respondent

How Transmitted to HUD: email

Date of Document: April 21, 2025

Date Obtained: April 21, 2025

Respondents have reviewed their records and have not been able to locate any records relating to CP's visit. Grey Roosters does manage the property and markets on several platforms.

When someone is interested in a unit, they are invited to schedule a tour. Tours are often conducted by one of the fellow tenants for the multi-family units. If the prospective tenant is interested Grey Roosters provides them with a link to an application. The rental application is processed through a third party.

Respondent understands that CP found the property via FaceBook post by Nalla Nalla whose real name is Alex Silva. Respondent requested Mr. Silva review his records to see whether he has any record of CP's request. Renan Yared and David Braun have reviewed their cell phones and Facebook messages and did not find any record there. The Ring camera footage for the property was also reviewed, but any footage from that date had already been overwritten.

According to CP she was shown the property by an unknown woman she asked what she needed to do to move forward with the application process. The woman who showed the property then called an unidentified gentleman who allegedly informed he that she was going to have to pay a pet deposit and pet rent for her service animal.

Grey Roosters continues to grant individuals accommodation to help with their disabilities. Grey Roosters for example currently have 2 tenants with service animals one of whom resides at the same property that CP originally visited.

Unfortunately, neither CP or Grey Roosters know who it is that CP spoke with over the phone that day. What we do know though is that CP never submitted an application for tenancy at the property in question. Without an application, we had no opportunity to evaluate her eligibility, it is unknown whether she was qualified to rent the dwelling. Grey Roosters does not discriminate against individuals on the basis of any protected class status.

Nature of Document: Rebuttal request

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: email

Date of Document: April 21, 2025

Date Obtained: April 21, 2025

Sent CP The Grey Roosters Position Statement for rebuttal.

Nature of Document: Rebuttal
Who Provided: Complainant
How Transmitted to HUD: email
Date of Document: April 22, 2025
Date Obtained: April 22, 2025

CP stated she had nothing to add. Attached her original rebuttal.

CP stated the "Nalla Nalla" from Facebook communications should have phone records from November 4th showing the messages and possible phone calls, and that he should know who he called to show the property.

There is no way to evaluate her eligibility because she did not submit an application. CP states she is a disabled veteran on a fixed income and time was of the essence. Once Mr. Silva verbally told her she would not rent to her if she did not agree to the additional pet fees, it did not make sense for her to waste her time and money on an application

Nature of Document: Returned mail
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: mail
Date of Document: March 28, 2025
Date Obtained: April 22, 2025

Returned mail for Grey Roosters.

Nature of Document: RFI Response from Resp
Who Provided: Respondent
How Transmitted to HUD: email
Date of Document: May 05, 2025
Date Obtained: May 05, 2025

Respondent provided a lease for an additional person who has a service animal on R Roosters' properties. This lease does not include a pet deposit or pet fee.
Also provided the service animal ID card to show it is a service animal.

Nature of Document: Email from CP
Who Provided: Complainant
How Transmitted to HUD: email
Date of Document: May 16, 2025
Date Obtained: May 19, 2025

CP is moving due to financial reasons. Provided mother's address to receive mail.

Nature of Document: 100 day letters to parites
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Certified mail

Date of Document: March 04, 2025

Date Obtained:

100 day letter to parties.

Nature of Document: 100 day letters to Respondent

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: March 10, 2025

Date Obtained:

100 day certified letters with Signature received

Nature of Document: 100 day letters to CP

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: March 10, 2025

Date Obtained:

100 day letter to CP with signature received

Nature of Document: Signed Complaint

Who Provided: CP

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: November 27, 2024

Date Obtained:

Nature of Document: Sunbiz search records

Who Provided: Intake

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: December 05, 2024

Date Obtained:

Sunbiz search results

Nature of Document: Property Appraisers search results

Who Provided: Intake

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: December 05, 2024

Date Obtained:

Property app search results

Nature of Document: RFI to Respondent Representative

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: February 26, 2025
Date Obtained:

RFI to Respondent Rep asking for any possible video footage from the approximate date and time when CP visited the property.

Nature of Document: Rebuttal request
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: January 14, 2025
Date Obtained:

Request for CP's rebuttal to Position Stmt.

Nature of Document: RFI to CP
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: February 10, 2025
Date Obtained:

Email to CP requesting if she recognizes the names Respondent attorney provided as to the persons she spoke to while viewing the property.

Nature of Document: Email to Respondent Representative
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: February 11, 2025
Date Obtained:

Requesting lease information not attached.
Need information for tenant with service animal.
Told Respondent Rep, the woman that showed CP the unit was Elce according to CP and the man on the phone had a strong foreign accent.

Nature of Document: Emails with CP
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: February 14, 2025
Date Obtained:

Emails with CP setting up phone interview.

Nature of Document: RFI to CP
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: January 21, 2025
Date Obtained:

Requested full message thread with Respondent from FaceBook property listing

Nature of Document: RFI to Resp
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: January 22, 2025
Date Obtained:

Sent RFI to Respondent requesting additional information.

Nature of Document: RFI to CP
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: February 07, 2025
Date Obtained:

RFI request to CP asking for verification of CP's need for service animal.

Nature of Document: RFI to CP
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: February 10, 2025
Date Obtained:

Sent email to CP requesting verification of her need for her service animal. Attached HUD's guidance to assist her.

Nature of Document: Notification Letters
Who Provided: Intake
How Transmitted to HUD:
Date of Document: December 05, 2024
Date Obtained:

OHR letter sent to RP 1 sent to

2001 Develop LLC
c/o David Brawn, Registered Agent
13801 Walsingham Road
Suite A436
Largo, FL 33774
Contains
Cover letter
Copy of signed 903

Conciliation form
RFI questions
100 day notice
Registered mail notice

Nature of Document: Notification Letters
Who Provided: Intake
How Transmitted to HUD:
Date of Document: December 05, 2024
Date Obtained:
OHR letter to CP Sent to
Crystal Allen
5214 27th Ave. S.
Gulfport, FL 33707

Contains
Cover letter
903 signed copy
100-day notice

Nature of Document: Amended complaint to Respondent
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Certified mail
Date of Document: March 28, 2025
Date Obtained:

Amended complaint sent certified mail to R The Grey Roosters.

Nature of Document: Email to Respondent Representative
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Email
Date of Document: April 07, 2025
Date Obtained:

Email to R 2001 Attorney letting him know the amended complaint sent to both respondents were returned. Asked that he verify he received the amended complaint and if he will represent both Respondents.

Attached copies of returned mail.

Nature of Document: RFI to Resp
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: email
Date of Document: May 05, 2025
Date Obtained:

Good afternoon. After reviewing the position statement from The Grey Roosters, LLC. I am requesting the following:

1. An interview with Alex Silva as he has not responded to my phone messages.
2. The lease for the second service animal that was mentioned in the position statement.

Provide the lease no later than May 12, 2025.

I am available this week Tuesday through Thursday 8 am until 3:30 pm and 8 am until 10:30 am on Friday for the interview with Mr. Silva. Let me know when the interview can be scheduled.

Nature of Document: Interview with CP

Who Provided:

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: February 20, 2025

Date Obtained:

CP stated she found the ad for the unit on Facebook, there was no contact information; she clicked and messaged the seller.

They made arrangements to view the property. The seller sent her the address the day of the meeting.

CP looked around, this was in her price range.

The person showing the unit did not have details. There was another unit on the other side she was shown that was bigger. The person showing the unit told CP she was "only here to open the door". CP liked the bigger unit better.

CP thinks there were 4-5 units at this location.

CP wanted to move forward. The woman called a person and was speaking a different language. The woman then put the person on speaker to talk to CP to answer questions.

CP asked about the application process, deposit and the details were given by the man on the phone.

The man then asked if she had pets, CP stated no, she had a service animal. The man then told her she had to pay a pet deposit and pet rent. She informed him that the dog is a service animal and therefore not required to pay pet deposits and pet fees. The man talked down to her and told her, "look, if your not going to agree to pay the deposit and pet fees, there is no point going forward." The woman and man began speaking the another language again and CP left.

No application was made, everything was verbal in the unit.

He would not move forward if she did not verbally agree to pay fees.

CP did not observe any other animals on property.

CP did not observe kids items.

CP only knew of the two units shown to be open at the time.

CP felt overall frustration, she told the man on the phone that she is a disabled veteran.

Once the man got irritated, CP could not speak to him.

Regarding the dog trainer:

CP had to interview with the trainer. There are policies as to who can get the training for their dogs.

CP had the dog before training. The dog had to perform an interview with the trainer as well to

identify if he was trainable for what was needed.
Did not get dog through this service.

Nature of Document: Interview with Kacprzyk
Who Provided:
How Transmitted to HUD:
Date of Document: March 11, 2025
Date Obtained:

Interviewing Ms. Kacprzyk. She was identified by Respondent as a person living at the property in question with a service animal.

Ms. Kacprzyk stated her address is 2001 2nd St. S #B, St. Petersburg FL.
She stated she has a service animal, a dog (Catahoula mix).
She stated she did not pay a pet deposit or a monthly pet fee for her service animal.
She stated she had the dog when she moved in on December 1, 2024.
She stated she does not know the owners personally.
She found the listing on Zillow and spoke with Grey Roosters David and Raynan(?).
She did not know if the dog was listed on the lease, she did not have it with her.

Nature of Document: Amended complaint to Respondent
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: Certified mail
Date of Document: March 28, 2025
Date Obtained:

Amended complaint sent certified mail to R 2001.

Nature of Document: Interview with Silva
Who Provided:
How Transmitted to HUD:
Date of Document: May 15, 2025
Date Obtained:

Mr. Silva, he stated that his position is a maintenance man for R Rooster. Mr. Silva stated that the Facebook profile Nalla Nalla is his profile. Mr. Silva stated Mr. Braun posted the advertisement for the unit using Mr. Silva's Nall Nalla Facebook page. Mr. Silva stated that Mr. Braun would have been the person responding to any inquiries and questions regarding the property. Mr. Silva did not have any interactions with CP, nor does Mr. Silva know who would have shown the unit to CP or who was called while CP was there. Mr. Silva stated that he knows of two service animals that are on the property in question.

Nature of Document: Amended complaint to CP for signature
Who Provided: PCOHR
How Transmitted to HUD: email

Date of Document: March 25, 2025

Date Obtained:

Sent amended complaint to CP for signature

Nature of Document: Amended complaint to Respondent Attorney

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD: Email

Date of Document: March 28, 2025

Date Obtained:

Sent R 2001 Attorney a courtesy copy of amended complaints.

Nature of Document: Interview with Renan Yared

Who Provided: PCOHR

How Transmitted to HUD:

Date of Document: May 15, 2025

Date Obtained:

Renan Yared, co-owner of R Roosters, stated he did not talk to CP. Mr. Yared stated he checked his records and there is nothing showing he was called to speak with CP. Mr. Yared stated that it could have only been himself or Mr. Braun that would have spoken to CP. Mr. Yared stated he did not know who showed the unit to CP. Mr. Yared stated that when showing a unit it could be one of the neighbors or it would be himself or Mr. Braun if they were in the area. Mr. Yared stated that when a unit is being shown by a neighbor, they will send the code via text to allow the unit to be shown. Mr. Yared stated it could have been Ellen, a resident that helps with cleaning and lives in Unit A. Mr. Yared stated nobody asked Ellen if she is the person who showed the unit to CP. Mr. Yared then said it could have been Elce. Mr. Yared stated he has not spoken with Elce to ask if she is the person who showed the unit. Mr. Yared stated he does not know who showed the unit or who the person would have called.

Mr. Yared was asked if they always use the same template for their leases. Mr. Yared stated yes, the same template is used. Mr. Yared stated that he is the person who handles all the leases, including adding any clauses to the lease. Mr. Yared stated that if a clause was added to a lease, it was purposely included by himself.

Mr. Yared stated pets are allowed as long as they are told about them. There is a two-hundred-dollar pet deposit and twenty-five dollars a month pet fee added for all pets. Mr. Yared stated service animals are not charged these fees/rent. Mr. Yared stated he is aware of two service animals at this location. Mr. Yared identified them as Alyssa, unit B and Melanie, unit D.

C. Interrogatories

D. Factual Observations

Betina Baron
Betina Baron, Compliance Manager