

Friday, March 27, 2026

Rebuttal to Property Manager Response

**Michigan Attorney General
Consumer Protection Division**

RE: Formal Rebuttal to Canterbury East Apartments Property Manager Response

Dear Attorney General's Office,

This letter serves as my formal rebuttal to the response submitted by the property manager of Canterbury East Apartments concerning my complaint. The response provided contains multiple false statements, misrepresentations, timeline distortions, and incorrect descriptions of building and safety code requirements. This rebuttal is based on documented evidence including FOIA inspection reports, video evidence, written communications, my original 11/6/2025 complaint, and applicable building codes.

1. Claim: I refused an in-person meeting.

This is false. I requested a standard, neutral housing inspection as required by law. A code inspection cannot legally be conditioned on meeting with the landlord. Tenants are not required to attend such meetings.

2. Claim: I stated the only acceptable resolution was a monetary fine.

False. At no point did I ever make such a statement. I repeatedly requested a lawful housing inspection, code compliance, correction of hazardous conditions, and documentation required to be provided to tenants by law.

3. Claim: All work orders were completed.

False. FOIA inspection records prove that the dishwasher was not removed until more than 70 days after the initial complaint—beyond the 30-day maximum correction period required by housing code.

4. Claim: Hallway lights were replaced and verified by the Fire Department.

This is incorrect. All inspections were conducted during daylight hours while the building's hallway lights are controlled by a timer and remain off until after dark. MPFD never saw the lights on, never tested the timer, and could not have verified compliance.

5. Claim: The deadbolt worked properly and I interfered with the lock.

False. FOIA reports do not state any such interference. A firefighter's own body camera video captures him offering me a new lock or a new key.

6. Claim: Dishwasher replaced and verified.

False timeline. FOIA records show the dishwasher was scheduled for removal on December 4, 2025 and was not removed until mid-January.

7. Claim: Emergency lighting meets code because reflective EXIT signs exist.

Incorrect. EXIT signs do not provide illumination, are not emergency lighting, and do not activate during power outages.

8. Claim: Bedroom light was disassembled by tenant.

False. No FOIA documents support this accusation.

9. Claim: No other tenants complained.

Irrelevant. Code compliance is not dependent on the number of complaints.

10. Claim: There is a harassment matter.

Unsubstantiated. No notice, case number, or law enforcement documentation exists.

11. Claim: Property manager responded using current conditions instead of conditions at the time of complaint.

My complaint to the Attorney General was submitted on November 6, 2025. The property manager's response describes repairs and conditions from December 2025 and January 2026—months after the complaint.

12. My Original 11/6/2025 Complaint for Reference:

"Dear Consumer Protection Division,

My name is Jacob Palasek, and I am a tenant at Canterbury Apartments East in Mount Pleasant, MI. I am currently receiving FAP and Medicaid assistance, and I moved into my apartment around May 1, 2025.

I am writing to report serious housing code violations and a failure of local enforcement by Fire Chief Doug Lobsinger, who oversees housing code compliance in Mount Pleasant. Despite submitting five detailed complaints citing specific violations of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC),

Chief Lobsinger has refused to investigate unless I agree to meet with the property manager. Michigan Housing Law does not require such a meeting and mandates that tenant complaints be investigated. Only one of ten reported issues was partially addressed, and the repair was substandard and possibly illegal (electrical work done by unverified personnel). The remaining issues were ignored.

I am also concerned about retaliation. At my previous residence (Park Place CMU), I was not offered a lease renewal after reporting similar violations. I fear the same may happen again, and I cannot afford to move.

Two other tenants in my building are experiencing the same issues with both the property manager and Chief Lobsinger.

I am requesting that your office investigate this matter and take appropriate action to ensure compliance with housing codes and tenant protection laws.

Please let me know if additional documentation is needed. I am available at (989) 824-8945.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Jacob Palasek"

13. Fire Chief's August 26, 2025 Email Proves He Conditioned Code Enforcement on a Meeting.

The Fire Chief wrote: "I will not continue to have an email exchange... Solutions are created through face-to-face communication." This email confirms he refused to investigate unless I agreed to meet with the property manager.

14. My August 26, 2025 Reply to the Fire Chief (Requesting Enforcement, Not a Meeting):

"I need you to enforce the law. I do not need to talk to you in person. The law does not say if you do not talk to me in person then I don't have to enforce the law... Once again, I do not need to talk to you or meet face to face in order for you to do what the mayor orders you to do."

Conclusion:

The property manager's response contains multiple factual inaccuracies disproven by FOIA records, emails, and code standards. Several critical safety violations were never inspected properly or were falsely certified as compliant. I respectfully request further review by the Attorney General's Office.

Sincerely,

Jacob Palasek