

Part 5: The Rental Law, the Missing Link

If we want to enforce the law, the law must be enforceable. Otherwise, the law will only become a gate of corruption, manipulating the fate of citizens. From my humble point of view, the problem of removing building violations cannot be solved simply by renewing the building law because the rental law also plays a vital part. The two laws are like the two sides of a single coin. The rental law, which I consider to be the missing link that nobody has ever discussed before, is the main obstacle to those who wish to remove their violations. According to the law, if the municipality gives a warning to a violator, he has only 15 days to remove it before he's referred to the court. But can this be considered as an appropriate time limit? The property is not a grocery store that can sell its goods in mere hours. If the violation is within a leased space, removing it requires evacuating the tenants from the premises first. But there is no provision in the rent law which states that leased premises need to be evacuated because of a building violation. Because of that, the owner is forced to resort to the courts based on the municipality's violation. The judiciary takes many years, and the tenants may not be ordered to vacate the premises unless the violation effects the safety of the building. In short, the issue will take a very long time. Moreover, if the Municipality has MEW cut off the electricity to the building, the owner will find some other loophole which will allow him to get it back. The laws are uncoordinated and don't support each other. The solution lies in the addition of an article to the rental laws which states that a rental contract will be void if it pertains to a space which violates the building codes, and it should allow for lawful eviction within the timeframes determined by the Municipality. Also, the owner who rented out a violating space should be obligated