

Presiding Judge: Robert C. Kropf
Date/Time: 2015-11-18 8:30 AM – 9:45 AM

Hickory Hills vs. (I could not hear the name)

This case seemed to be more of the tenants posing a case against the landlord.

Facts:

1. Tenants lease had expired
2. Tenants want to recover items left behind
3. Back rent: \$980

Tenant Arguments: The man and woman seemed like they were trying to play up the “victim” card of the case. They claimed that they were trying to retrieve items from their previous place of residence, but the property manager was being extremely confrontational. Claiming the manager was not allowing them into the property, being rude, and unreasonable.

Property Manager Arguments: The property manager said that he has not spoken with the tenants in quite a long time. He also said he hasn’t even seen them around since the lease had expired. He also said that the previous tenants could come and go as they please, there was no one stopping them from getting their items. The manager also said that there was back rent due to the sum of \$980.

Judge’s Ruling: The judge ruled that the previous tenants will pay the property manager the \$980 that they owe and they had until December 1, 2015 to remove their items from the property.

My Thoughts: I feel this is an extremely fair ruling. The judge could have been much harder on the tenants as all they kept saying is how they’ve been sick and in and out of hospitals, basically nothing concerning the case. They even kind of had a “deer in headlights” when the judge called them out on their nonsense. He simply told them to pay what is owed and gave them almost two weeks to retrieve their items.

Helt vs. Collisan

Facts

1. Back rent: \$1840.60
2. Tenant claims they did not owe the back rent

Landlord Arguments: The landlord claimed that the tenant owed back rent to the sum of \$1840.60. He also had documentation (which the judge also had) of the missed payments and the current balance.

Tenant Arguments: The tenant claimed they did not know this amount was owed. She also did not know how much, to which the judge asked if she had seen the paper with the balance on it before walking in the courtroom. She replied yes, that she had seen it. She seemed extremely unprepared for the hearing. The tenant also claimed that she did not owe anything to the landlord.

Judge’s Ruling: The judge did not give a ruling. The tenant decided they wanted to take the case to trial.

My Thoughts: This case wasn’t settled, but I thought it to be more interesting than the rest of what I saw. The tenant seemed very untruthful is all I have on the matter.

Most of the morning went EXTREMELY fast. There was another case, Ayes vs. Pete, which was settled by the tenant moving out by December 3, 2015. The people spoke so quietly that it was hard to hear what exactly was happening. I counted nine cases that were ruled by default due to the defendant not appearing. There were two cases the landlord decided to dismiss. Most of the other cases were settled and the judge just asked the defendant if they understood what they had signed and that they had three days to contact the court if they change their mind and did not understand the document. My experience was extremely interesting, I cannot believe how unprepared people seem to be when attending court.