

House Judiciary

03/24/2026

HB26-1106 Eviction Protections for Tenants

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
Aileen Berrios Against themselves	We own several rental properties and have worked well with all our tenants. This bill only increases cost and time for the owners of properties and it does nothing to help the tenants if they are being evicted. Most owners of rental homes have mortgages which have to be paid monthly no matter what. Increasing expenses and time will only make housing cost more - we need to do more to bring housing costs DOWN.
Balachandar Chandrasekaran Against themselves	Poses significant new burdens for housing providers. Against the Bill
Cameron Leger For themselves	To the House Judiciary Committee, I urge you to support HB26-1106, which establishes critical eviction protections that balance vulnerable population safeguards with reasonable outcomes for all parties involved in Colorado's housing system. This bill protects families from eviction during medical emergencies, eliminates the practice of naming children as defendants, and ensures tenants have fair access to the court system when facing housing instability. By limiting daily eviction case scheduling, courts can provide meaningful attention to each case rather than processing them as assembly-line procedures. The requirement for hearings before judgment when tenants express intent to cure nonpayment prevents homelessness from temporary financial setbacks. Extending writ execution timing and prohibiting evictions during inclement weather demonstrates basic human dignity in our legal system.

	<p>These protections align with Colorado's commitment to housing stability and judicial fairness. The bill maintains accountability through its substantial violations exception while ensuring that hospitalization, disability accommodation requests, and transportation issues do not automatically result in loss of housing.</p> <p>I strongly encourage the committee to advance HB26-1106 to protect Colorado families from preventable homelessness and ensure our eviction system serves justice for all parties.</p>
<p>Chris Beabout Against Livmark Communities</p>	<p>Dear Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Chris Beabout, and I am writing on behalf of Livmark Communities, a local Colorado-based housing provider. We develop and operate rental communities across the state.</p> <p>I respectfully oppose House Bill 26-1106.</p> <p>While we support reasonable tenant protections, this bill creates significant operational and financial challenges that will ultimately reduce housing availability in Colorado.</p> <p>Key Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evictions prohibited during certain weather conditions Preventing enforcement of writs of restitution during common weather events (below 32°F, above 90°F, or precipitation) could delay lawful evictions for extended periods, especially during winter. • Delays after court-ordered possession Even after a court ruling, enforcement may be postponed, undermining the judicial process and prolonging nonpayment situations. • Daily limits on eviction cases Capping cases courts can hear will create backlogs, increasing costs and delaying resolution for both residents and housing providers.

	<p>⌘ Expanded ability to reopen cases ⌘“ Allowing cases to be reopened after judgment for a broad set of reasons reduces certainty and finality in legal proceedings.</p> <p>⌘ Elimination of appeal bond protections ⌘“ Removing these protections exposes housing providers to extended periods of nonpayment during appeals with little ability to recover losses.</p> <p>Broader Impact:</p> <p>These provisions create uncertainty in enforcing lease agreements and court rulings. This added risk will lead to higher rents, reduced housing supply, and stricter tenant screening outcomes that ultimately harm the very residents this bill aims to protect. We know first hand that national developers are already looking the other way when choosing where to build due to the existing Colorado regulatory environment. This bill would further reduce new supply.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We urge the legislature to reconsider HB26-1106 and pursue more balanced solutions that protect tenants while preserving the viability of housing providers.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Chris Beabout Managing Partner Livmark Communities</p>
<p>David Vickers Against themself</p>	<p>We had a situation a few years ago when our tennant refused to clean our rental condo, to the point that there was a large mouse infestation that affected other units. When it became apparant that we were going to evict her, she plugged all of the drains and ran the water, flooding our unit and threatening other units with mold damage. We were not allowed to go in and begin remediation until the eviction process completed 30 days later, all the while neighboring units were being damaged. We don't need to make it harder to evict people - we need an</p>

	<p>emergency eviction process for such cases, when others are being harmed by the action of a rogue tenant.</p>
<p>Eric Rentschler Against themselves</p>	<p>HB26-1106 is well-intentioned, but in practice it risks harming the very renters it aims to protect.</p> <p>By making it significantly harder to enforce leases or regain possession, even after a lawful court ruling, the bill introduces substantial uncertainty into the rental market. Property owners would face unpredictable delays, prolonged nonpayment, and limited legal recourse. When contracts can't be reliably enforced, the basic functioning of the housing market is undermined.</p> <p>This heightened risk doesn't just affect large landlords, it hits small, local housing providers the hardest. Many rely on timely rent to cover mortgages, taxes, and maintenance. If they can't depend on the legal system to uphold agreements, some will exit the market entirely, convert units to other uses, or avoid renting in the first place.</p> <p>That leads directly to a key unintended consequence: a reduction in the supply of affordable housing. As risk increases, fewer units are offered for rent, and remaining landlords raise rents or tighten screening criteria to compensate. The result is fewer options and higher costs, especially for lower-income renters who already face limited choices.</p> <p>In short, HB26-1106 doesn't solve housing instability, it shifts risk in a way that discourages participation in the rental market. A sustainable solution should balance tenant protections with clear, enforceable rules that keep housing providers willing and able to offer rental homes.</p>
<p>Gina Esposito Against themselves</p>	<p>I believe this bill will not only hurt property owners but also cause issues for the banks where our loans are from if we continue passing laws in favor of the tenants. If they are unable to pay their rent for consecutive months and the home owners default on the loan because we make it easier and easier for tenants to get over. If tenants are intentionally delaying court hearings and now they're given expanded excuses to miss court hearings it is posing a strain on our court systems and taxpayers money. Combine that with daily limits on eviction cases and the elimination of the appeal bonds protection, it further delays resolution for the homeowners and burdens the banks where our loans are from. Why are we granting solace and additional assistance for tenants who are not upholding their end of the lease agreements? This is a terrible piece of legislation!</p>

<p>Jason Sherrill</p> <p>Against</p> <p>Livmark Communities / Landmark Homes</p>	<p>Dear Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Jason Sherrill, and I am writing on behalf of Livmark Communities, a local Colorado-based housing provider. We develop and operate rental communities across the state.</p> <p>I am also CEO of Landmark Homes based out of Northern Colorado.</p> <p>I respectfully oppose House Bill 26-1106.</p> <p>While we support reasonable tenant protections, this bill creates significant operational and financial challenges that will ultimately reduce housing availability and affordability in Colorado.</p> <p>Key Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evictions prohibited during certain weather conditions Preventing enforcement of writs of restitution during common weather events (below 32°F, above 90°F, or precipitation) could delay lawful evictions for extended periods, especially during winter.• Delays after court-ordered possession Even after a court ruling, enforcement may be postponed, undermining the judicial process and prolonging nonpayment situations.• Daily limits on eviction cases Capping cases courts can hear will create backlogs, increasing costs and delaying resolution for both residents and housing providers.• Expanded ability to reopen cases Allowing cases to be reopened after judgment for a broad set of reasons reduces certainty and finality in legal proceedings.
--	---

	<p>“ Elimination of appeal bond protections “ Removing these protections exposes housing providers to extended periods of nonpayment during appeals with little ability to recover losses.</p> <p>Broader Impact:</p> <p>These provisions create uncertainty in enforcing lease agreements and court rulings. This added risk will lead to higher rents, reduced housing supply, and stricter tenant screening”outcomes that ultimately harm the very residents this bill aims to protect. We know first hand that national developers are already looking the other way when choosing where to build due to the existing Colorado regulatory environment. This bill would further reduce new supply.</p> <p>Also as a homebuilder focused on delivering to the missing middle all these new regulations, amongst others, aiming to protect the home renter and home buyer ultimately increase the cost of the process and extend the struggle to deliver attainable housing.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We urge the legislature to reconsider HB26-1106 and pursue more balanced solutions that protect tenants while preserving the viability of housing providers.</p>
<p>JEANY RUSH</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: House Transportation, Housing, & Local Government 3-24-26</p> <p>RE: HB26-1196 Tenant Data Information RESENT</p> <p>Sponsors: J. Joseph, R. English</p> <p>FROM: Jeany Rush, Colorado Constituent, 3-3-26</p> <p>Vote: No</p> <p>FIRST/FOREMOST: Here you go again with the “Dictator for a Day” award on the abuse of the Safety Clause! You have created yet another bill to not just interfere with business, commerce, but the rights of the citizens to conduct their own affairs in business.</p> <p>Yes, we need to protect tenants, landlords, and others in these markets. However, we already have laws, procedures, statutes, “ad nauseum”</p>

	<p>Dumping yet more edicts upon landlords, and treating tenants like they are ignorant, uneducated, or other issues, is insulting. The landlords cannot continue to do business when the tenant is so highly enabled, that it becomes “anti-business” and destroys the rights of all. The Tenants have to take some responsibility for their actions, and to force anyone to submit to credit agencies, is also a stretch. If the tenant can receive a receipt, confirmation, which they can provide, that could be usable. But to force another layer of steps, forms, procedures upon the landlords, while the tenant is presumed to not be able to take care of themselves, shows me one thing. You are creating laws to protect those here illegally, who do not necessarily know the language, and do not understand basic business. Further, while this body votes to “Hog TIE” our real law enforcement, enabling more lawless people into our state, it is tragic, and wrong to keep forcing the business owners to pay the price. Those in the low income brackets have ways to receive help, and assistance. It is not the job of the landlords to hold their hands. We are not attacking low income tenants; and I also agree that they deserve fair treatment, having been a single mom, I know how difficult it can be. But, this body needs to stop going over the edge to punish the citizens, and they need protection as well.</p> <p>The extra steps you are creating on landlords also feels like more discouragement to actually have landlords in business. You cannot just force all home/business ownerships to be destroyed for the “SMART/Not smart” large buildings to pop up, at the cost of real property ownerships, in a WEF Global Communist Style Future!</p>
<p>Jordan Bellington Against themselves</p>	<p>I am opposing this bill for several reasons but, the largest one is it provides an imbalance to tenants over landlords. I have been a renter and a landlord. The two are always in a balanced relationship and agreement. This bill would sway too much leverage to the tenants and removed proper incentives for landlords to even want to work with tenants.</p> <p>Having people evicted because of something that landlords cannot control, literally the weather, is ridiculous. It's the landlords responsibility to take care of their space and of course should not be overlooked but, when it's in the process of eviction, this will become an even bigger problem.</p>
<p>Josh Longenecker Against Springman, Braden, Wilson & Pontius, P.C.</p>	<p>As a small company that rents out three properties, I personally have the mortgages tied to them. There is no large system in place to protect me if something goes wrong.</p> <p>For the past few years, I’ve opened up my properties to individuals in my community who need housing while they are working. Most are coming from out of state for 6-9 months and want a place that feels</p>

	<p>like home. This includes traveling nurses, tradespeople, and other professionals.</p> <p>This only works if the system remains predictable for any type of tenant I get. This act will make it so that if a tenant decides to stop paying rent, I will not be able to quickly resolve the situation. There will be delays in getting in front of a court, limits on how cases are handled, and even after a judgment, the case could be reopened. There will also be appeals without requiring financial accountability.</p> <p>Meanwhile, my responsibilities do not change. The mortgages still have to be paid, and the expenses tied to the properties do not stop.</p> <p>I do not have a large financial cushion or a corporation behind me. If a tenant stops paying rent, I can realistically carry that for about one month before it starts putting the property at risk. I have already experienced late payments that nearly led to serious financial consequences.</p> <p>If the process becomes longer and more uncertain, I take on more risk for the same fixed rent. This will force me to be more selective with who I rent to, or stop offering housing in situations where there is uncertainty. This directly impacts the people I have been helping in my community.</p> <p>I view my properties as long-term investments, and I have considered expanding. However, if the laws continue to increase risk while making the process harder to manage, I will have to reconsider continuing in this area.</p> <p>I understand the intent behind tenant protections, but this shifts too much risk onto small housing providers like myself. At a certain point, it becomes unsustainable. Good tenants will also feel the impact through higher costs or stricter requirements to rent.</p> <p>I ask that you take into consideration how this will impact small providers and the availability of housing in the community.</p>
<p>Jun Peng</p>	<p>I am here to testify against the bill</p>

Against themselves	
Justin Carter Against themselves	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I humbly request you to not pass this bill. I am a small landlord and try my best to offer a reasonable space with reasonable terms to reasonable people. Over time, we have struggled with the increasingly challenging bills including how r.u.b.s are levied. I own an older property and converting each unit to their own meter is beyond what my pocket book can afford. It means I have to advertise my property with the utilities baked in and make it look more expensive than other 1 to 1 meter properties. I have been out 25% of my tenants and it has been challenging. With the new bill, it will wipe out any buffer I have for fixing up the place or if there was a weather event that insurance didn't fully cover. There are plenty of bills that are very protective of tenants. Additionally, it feels unfair as a citizen, that my needs as a landlord are not being considered in any of this legislation. There are plenty of people who are trying to do the right thing and somehow, we keep seeing more bills that make it harder and harder to provide a good service. This bill also doesn't allow new folks to move in if squatters are taking up the space. Denver is a home to so many people from so many different cities and states, one of my tenants is from AZ. They are not able to make many parts of Denver their new home with this bill. If homelessness is the ultimate goal to address, let's please address it with publicly funded programs rather than making people who operate on very thin margins responsible for this greater problem. I suggest having temporary, government-funded financial assistance that pays rent during the time that tenants do not. Thank you for listening.</p> <p>Justin Carter</p>
Kelly Owens Against themselves	<p>Our neighborhood has been negatively impacted by tenant over staying their welcome. So much so that the original homeowner was living in a homeless shelter while literal drug addicted individuals ruined her house.</p> <p>I hear more negative eviction stories than positive. Please don't make it more difficult.</p>
Kevin Spotts Against	<p>I have lived in Colorado Springs since 1979. My wife and I have multiple rental properties in the form of single-family homes. We are against HB26-1106 concerning eviction protections for tenants. The courts already take too long to complete these cases. We need to simplify the</p>

<p>themselves</p>	<p>process, not make it longer and more complicated for landlords. Colorado is going the wrong direction with legislature like this. My father had a rental home in Falcon, CO and the squatters didn't pay rent or utilities for almost a year. My father, a retired Viet Nam veteran, is on a fixed income. The home he was renting was his prior house that he had moved out of. He had to wait for the court for many months to try to evict the tenants. He paid 2 mortgages while the squatters paid nothing!</p> <p>Please reject this bill.</p> <p>Kevin Spotts; 719-306-3431</p> <p>spottless39@gmail.com</p>
<p>Scott Berkman Against themselves</p>	<p>I hereby testify that I am against this. There are plenty of protections in place for residents/tenants. This will only hurt landlords for invalid reasons.</p>

Cathleen Welch
Regional Property Manager / ALLAN Ltd
2750 Vickers Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
cwelch@allanllc.com
719-313-9021

March 24, 2026

To:
Representative David Lindsay
Representative Yadira Velasco
Representative Chris Weissman
Senator Julie Michaelson Jenet

Re: Urgent Concerns Regarding HB26-1106

Dear Representatives Lindsay, Velasco, Weissman, and Senator Michaelson Jenet,

I am writing as a housing professional who manages residential communities and works daily to provide safe, stable housing for residents. While the intent of HB26-1106—to protect tenants—is understandable, in its current form, it risks making housing less stable, less affordable, and less available across Colorado. I urge you to oppose this bill.

Colorado already faces a severe housing shortage. HB26-1106 would make it harder for landlords to manage properties efficiently by restricting fees, increasing paperwork, and making lease enforcement more difficult. These changes would increase costs for landlords, which inevitably are passed on to all residents. That means residents who consistently pay their rent on time and follow lease rules could end up subsidizing the costs of others who violate leases—a completely unfair outcome that penalizes responsible tenants.

Real-world example: In our communities, when a tenant repeatedly delays maintenance access—such as refusing entry for routine inspections, safety checks, or required repairs—property managers must reschedule staff visits, often multiple times, which increases operational costs and administrative time. Under HB26-1106, restrictions on fees or stricter notice requirements could prevent us from recovering these additional costs. The result would be higher rents or reduced services for all residents, including those who follow the rules, provide access promptly, and maintain their homes responsibly. Responsible tenants would effectively subsidize the operational burden caused by a few non-compliant residents.

The bill also adds new layers of compliance and notice requirements. Even minor administrative mistakes could result in penalties, legal disputes, or delayed enforcement of lease violations. In affordable housing programs such as LIHTC or HUD-subsidized properties, compliance is already complex. Additional restrictions risk creating operational chaos, discouraging investment, and slowing the development of new housing at a time when Colorado desperately needs it.

Furthermore, the bill would make eviction processes slower and more complicated. When a resident violates their lease, delays in resolution can destabilize entire communities, increase financial stress for compliant tenants, and force property owners to absorb additional costs—all during a time of economic uncertainty and rising inflation.

In short, HB26-1106 shifts costs and risk onto responsible tenants and landlords, threatens the financial viability of housing providers, and could reduce the overall housing supply in Colorado. At a time when residents are struggling with rising rents and economic instability, this is exactly the wrong direction.

I strongly urge you to oppose HB26-1106 and instead work toward solutions that protect tenants without destabilizing communities, penalizing responsible residents, or discouraging investment in Colorado housing.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Cathleen Welch

ROBIN R. ROSSENFELD, ESQ.
Admitted in Colorado, New York, Florida

9 South Downing Street, Denver, CO 80209
(303) 284-8708 (720) 934-7081 (cell)

My name is Robin Rossenfeld. I am a licensed attorney and hold an MBA. I am here today because, based on my legal and financial training, I believe this bill will raise the rents of thousands of Coloradans. Let me walk you through the reasons I have come to this conclusion.

First, the bill will increase landlord risk and force renters to pay for the risk. Every rental property is an investment asset. Investors, whether an individual with a duplex or a REIT managing thousands of units, price their product based on expected return relative to risk. This is foundational investment economics.

HB26-1106 increases risk in at least four distinct ways:

- First, The extension of the writ of restitution from 48 hours to 30 days. A landlord who wins an eviction judgment may still not regain possession for a month, during which the tenant may cause additional damage and pays no rent.
- Second, the bill lists reasons including "transportation issues" and "electronic filing complications" as grounds to vacate a judgment entirely. This creates enormous litigation uncertainty.
- Third, under current law, a tenant who appeals must post a bond, ensuring the landlord receives some compensation during the appeal. Eliminating the appeals bond shifts 100% of the financial risk of an appeal onto the landlord.
- Fourth, the inclement weather prohibition on writ execution. In Colorado, where winter temperatures routinely drop below 32°F, this could effectively halt evictions for weeks or months during the coldest part of the year.

When you increase the risk of holding a rental asset, landlords must compensate for that increased risk. They do this through higher rents, stricter screening, larger security deposit demands, and reduced maintenance spending. Every one of these consequences falls on renters.

From a capital markets perspective, HB26-1106 makes Colorado rental property less attractive relative to competing investments, whether that's rental property in other states or entirely different asset classes within a geographical market area. When risk-adjusted returns decline and property owners are less certain of their rental income, developers will build fewer units.

The bill limits the number of eviction actions a court can schedule per day. Combined with the expanded grounds for excusing late answers and the extended writ timelines, Colorado county courts will face significant case backlogs. This doesn't just hurt landlords. Tenants in genuinely dangerous living situations who need court attention for habitability claims, tenants with legitimate defenses whose cases will be delayed alongside the rest, and the already under-resourced court system will all be negatively impacted by this unnecessary stopgap on court processing.

I urge the Committee to reject HB26-1106.

Thank you.

House Judiciary

03/24/2026 Upon Adjournment

HB26-1106 Eviction Protections for Tenants

Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
Jun Peng Against themselves	I am here to testify against the bill
Balachandar Chandrasekaran Against themselves	Poses significant new burdens for housing providers. Against the Bill
Justin Carter Against themselves	To whom it may concern, I humbly request you to not pass this bill. I am a small landlord and try my best to offer a reasonable space with reasonable terms to reasonable people. Over time, we have struggled with the increasingly challenging bills including how r.u.b.s are levied. I own an older property and converting each unit to their own meter is beyond what my pocket book can afford. It means I have to advertise my property with the utilities baked in and make it look more expensive than other 1 to 1 meter properties. I have been out 25% of my tenants and it has been challenging. With the new bill, it will wipe out any buffer I have for fixing up the place or if there was a weather event that insurance didn't fully cover. There are plenty of bills that are very protective of tenants. Additionally, it feels unfair as a citizen, that my needs as a landlord are not being considered in any of this legislation. There

	<p>are plenty of people who are trying to do the right thing and somehow, we keep seeing more bills that make it harder and harder to provide a good service. This bill also doesn't allow new folks to move in if squatters are taking up the space. Denver is a home to so many people from so many different cities and states, one of my tenants is from AZ. They are not able to make many parts of Denver their new home with this bill. If homelessness is the ultimate goal to address, let's please address it with publicly funded programs rather than making people who operate on very thin margins responsible for this greater problem. I suggest having temporary, government-funded financial assistance that pays rent during the time that tenants do not. Thank you for listening.</p> <p>Justin Carter</p>
<p>Josh Longenecker Against Springman, Braden, Wilson & Pontius, P.C.</p>	<p>As a small company that rents out three properties, I personally have the mortgages tied to them. There is no large system in place to protect me if something goes wrong.</p> <p>For the past few years, I’ve opened up my properties to individuals in my community who need housing while they are working. Most are coming from out of state for 6-9 months and want a place that feels like home. This includes traveling nurses, tradespeople, and other professionals.</p> <p>This only works if the system remains predictable for any type of tenant I get. This act will make it so that if a tenant decides to stop paying rent, I will not be able to quickly resolve the situation. There will be delays in getting in front of a court, limits on how cases are handled, and even after a judgment, the case could be reopened. There will also be appeals without requiring financial accountability.</p> <p>Meanwhile, my responsibilities do not change. The mortgages still have to be paid, and the expenses tied to the properties do not stop.</p>

	<p>I do not have a large financial cushion or a corporation behind me. If a tenant stops paying rent, I can realistically carry that for about one month before it starts putting the property at risk. I have already experienced late payments that nearly led to serious financial consequences.</p> <p>If the process becomes longer and more uncertain, I take on more risk for the same fixed rent. This will force me to be more selective with who I rent to, or stop offering housing in situations where there is uncertainty. This directly impacts the people I have been helping in my community.</p> <p>I view my properties as long-term investments, and I have considered expanding. However, if the laws continue to increase risk while making the process harder to manage, I will have to reconsider continuing in this area.</p> <p>I understand the intent behind tenant protections, but this shifts too much risk onto small housing providers like myself. At a certain point, it becomes unsustainable. Good tenants will also feel the impact through higher costs or stricter requirements to rent.</p> <p>I ask that you take into consideration how this will impact small providers and the availability of housing in the community.</p>
<p>Kelly Owens Against themselves</p>	<p>Our neighborhood has been negatively impacted by tenant over staying their welcome. So much so that the original homeowner was living in a homeless shelter while literal drug addicted individuals ruined her house.</p> <p>I hear more negative eviction stories than positive. Please don't make it more difficult.</p>
<p>Kevin Spotts</p>	<p>I have lived in Colorado Springs since 1979. My wife and I have multiple rental properties in the form of single-family homes. We</p>

<p>Against themselves</p>	<p>are against HB26-1106 concerning eviction protections for tenants. The courts already take too long to complete these cases. We need to simplify the process, not make it longer and more complicated for landlords. Colorado is going the wrong direction with legislature like this. My father had a rental home in Falcon, CO and the squatters didn't pay rent or utilities for almost a year. My father, a retired Viet Nam veteran, is on a fixed income. The home he was renting was his prior house that he had moved out of. He had to wait for the court for many months to try to evict the tenants. He paid 2 mortgages while the squatters paid nothing!</p> <p>Please reject this bill.</p> <p>Kevin Spotts; 719-306-3431 spottless39@gmail.com</p>
<p>Gina Esposito Against themselves</p>	<p>I believe this bill will not only hurt property owners but also cause issues for the banks where our loans are from if we continue passing laws in favor of the tenants. If they are unable to pay their rent for consecutive months and the home owners default on the loan because we make it easier and easier for tenants to get over. If tenants are intentionally delaying court hearings and now they're given expanded excuses to miss court hearings it is posing a strain on our court systems and taxpayers money. Combine that with daily limits on eviction cases and the elimination of the appeal bonds protection, it further delays resolution for the homeowners and burdens the banks where our loans are from. Why are we granting solace and additional assistance for tenants who are not upholding their end of the lease agreements? This is a terrible piece of legislation!</p>
<p>Eric Rentschler Against themselves</p>	<p>HB26-1106 is well-intentioned, but in practice it risks harming the very renters it aims to protect.</p> <p>By making it significantly harder to enforce leases or regain possession, even after a lawful court ruling, the bill introduces substantial uncertainty into the rental market. Property owners would face unpredictable delays, prolonged nonpayment, and limited legal recourse. When contracts can't be reliably</p>

	<p>enforced, the basic functioning of the housing market is undermined.</p> <p>This heightened risk doesn't just affect large landlords, it hits small, local housing providers the hardest. Many rely on timely rent to cover mortgages, taxes, and maintenance. If they can't depend on the legal system to uphold agreements, some will exit the market entirely, convert units to other uses, or avoid renting in the first place.</p> <p>That leads directly to a key unintended consequence: a reduction in the supply of affordable housing. As risk increases, fewer units are offered for rent, and remaining landlords raise rents or tighten screening criteria to compensate. The result is fewer options and higher costs, especially for lower-income renters who already face limited choices.</p> <p>In short, HB26-1106 doesn't solve housing instability, it shifts risk in a way that discourages participation in the rental market. A sustainable solution should balance tenant protections with clear, enforceable rules that keep housing providers willing and able to offer rental homes.</p>
<p>Cameron Leger For themselves</p>	<p>To the House Judiciary Committee,</p> <p>I urge you to support HB26-1106, which establishes critical eviction protections that balance vulnerable population safeguards with reasonable outcomes for all parties involved in Colorado's housing system.</p> <p>This bill protects families from eviction during medical emergencies, eliminates the practice of naming children as defendants, and ensures tenants have fair access to the court system when facing housing instability. By limiting daily eviction case scheduling, courts can provide meaningful attention to each case rather than processing them as assembly-line procedures.</p>

	<p>The requirement for hearings before judgment when tenants express intent to cure nonpayment prevents homelessness from temporary financial setbacks. Extending writ execution timing and prohibiting evictions during inclement weather demonstrates basic human dignity in our legal system.</p> <p>These protections align with Colorado's commitment to housing stability and judicial fairness. The bill maintains accountability through its substantial violations exception while ensuring that hospitalization, disability accommodation requests, and transportation issues do not automatically result in loss of housing.</p> <p>I strongly encourage the committee to advance HB26-1106 to protect Colorado families from preventable homelessness and ensure our eviction system serves justice for all parties.</p>
<p>Aileen Berrios Against themselves</p>	<p>We own several rental properties and have worked well with all our tenants. This bill only increases cost and time for the owners of properties and it does nothing to help the tenants if they are being evicted. Most owners of rental homes have mortgages which have to be paid monthly no matter what. Increasing expenses and time will only make housing cost more - we need to do more to bring housing costs DOWN.</p>
<p>Jordan Bellington Against themselves</p>	<p>I am opposing this bill for several reasons but, the largest one is it provides an imbalance to tenants over landlords. I have been a renter and a landlord. The two are always in a balanced relationship and agreement. This bill would sway too much leverage to the tenants and removed proper incentives for landlords to even want to work with tenants.</p> <p>Having people evicted because of something that landlords cannot control, literally the weather, is ridiculous. It's the landlords responsibility to take care of their space and of course should not be overlooked but, when it's in the process of eviction, this will become an even bigger problem.</p>
<p>David Vickers</p>	<p>We had a situation a few years ago when our tenant refused to clean our rental condo, to the point that there was a large mouse</p>

<p>Against themselves</p>	<p>infestation that affected other units. When it became apparant that we were going to evict her, she plugged all of the drains and ran the water, flooding our unit and threatening other units with mold damage. We were not allowed to go in and begin remediation until the eviction process completed 30 days later, all the while neighboring units were being damaged. We don't need to make it harder to evict people - we need an emergency eviction process for such cases, when others are being harmed by the action of a rogue tennant.</p>
<p>Chris Beabout Against Livmark Communities</p>	<p>Dear Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Chris Beabout, and I am writing on behalf of Livmark Communities, a local Colorado-based housing provider. We develop and operate rental communities across the state.</p> <p>I respectfully oppose House Bill 26-1106.</p> <p>While we support reasonable tenant protections, this bill creates significant operational and financial challenges that will ultimately reduce housing availability in Colorado.</p> <p>Key Concerns:</p> <p>“ Evictions prohibited during certain weather conditions “ Preventing enforcement of writs of restitution during common weather events (below 32°F, above 90°F, or precipitation) could delay lawful evictions for extended periods, especially during winter.</p> <p>“ Delays after court-ordered possession “ Even after a court ruling, enforcement may be postponed, undermining the judicial process and prolonging nonpayment situations.</p>

	<p>⌘ Daily limits on eviction cases ⌘“ Capping cases courts can hear will create backlogs, increasing costs and delaying resolution for both residents and housing providers.</p> <p>⌘ Expanded ability to reopen cases ⌘“ Allowing cases to be reopened after judgment for a broad set of reasons reduces certainty and finality in legal proceedings.</p> <p>⌘ Elimination of appeal bond protections ⌘“ Removing these protections exposes housing providers to extended periods of nonpayment during appeals with little ability to recover losses.</p> <p>Broader Impact:</p> <p>These provisions create uncertainty in enforcing lease agreements and court rulings. This added risk will lead to higher rents, reduced housing supply, and stricter tenant screening outcomes that ultimately harm the very residents this bill aims to protect. We know first hand that national developers are already looking the other way when choosing where to build due to the existing Colorado regulatory environment. This bill would further reduce new supply.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We urge the legislature to reconsider HB26-1106 and pursue more balanced solutions that protect tenants while preserving the viability of housing providers.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Chris Beabout Managing Partner</p>
--	---

	Livmark Communities
Jason Sherrill Against Livmark Communities / Landmark Homes	Dear Members of the Committee, My name is Jason Sherrill, and I am writing on behalf of Livmark Communities, a local Colorado-based housing provider. We develop and operate rental communities across the state. I am also CEO of Landmark Homes based out of Northern Colorado. I respectfully oppose House Bill 26-1106. While we support reasonable tenant protections, this bill creates significant operational and financial challenges that will ultimately reduce housing availability and affordability in Colorado. Key Concerns: • Evictions prohibited during certain weather conditions Preventing enforcement of writs of restitution during common weather events (below 32°F, above 90°F, or precipitation) could delay lawful evictions for extended periods, especially during winter. • Delays after court-ordered possession Even after a court ruling, enforcement may be postponed, undermining the judicial process and prolonging nonpayment situations.

	<p>⌘ Daily limits on eviction cases ⌘“ Capping cases courts can hear will create backlogs, increasing costs and delaying resolution for both residents and housing providers.</p> <p>⌘ Expanded ability to reopen cases ⌘“ Allowing cases to be reopened after judgment for a broad set of reasons reduces certainty and finality in legal proceedings.</p> <p>⌘ Elimination of appeal bond protections ⌘“ Removing these protections exposes housing providers to extended periods of nonpayment during appeals with little ability to recover losses.</p> <p>Broader Impact:</p> <p>These provisions create uncertainty in enforcing lease agreements and court rulings. This added risk will lead to higher rents, reduced housing supply, and stricter tenant screening outcomes that ultimately harm the very residents this bill aims to protect. We know first hand that national developers are already looking the other way when choosing where to build due to the existing Colorado regulatory environment. This bill would further reduce new supply.</p> <p>Also as a homebuilder focused on delivering to the missing middle all these new regulations, amongst others, aiming to protect the home renter and home buyer ultimately increase the cost of the process and extend the struggle to deliver attainable housing.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p>
--	---

	<p>We urge the legislature to reconsider HB26-1106 and pursue more balanced solutions that protect tenants while preserving the viability of housing providers.</p>
<p>JEANY RUSH Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: House Transportation, Housing, & Local Government 3-24-26 RE: HB26-1196 Tenant Data Information RESENT Sponsors: J. Joseph, R. English FROM: Jeany Rush, Colorado Constituent, 3-3-26 Vote: No FIRST/FOREMOST: Here you go again with the “Dictator for a Day” award on the abuse of the Safety Clause! You have created yet another bill to not just interfere with business, commerce, but the rights of the citizens to conduct their own affairs in business. Yes, we need to protect tenants, landlords, and others in these markets. However, we already have laws, procedures, statutes, “ead nauseum” Dumping yet more edicts upon landlords, and treating tenants like they are ignorant, uneducated, or other issues, is insulting. The landlords cannot continue to do business when the tenant is so highly enabled, that it becomes “anti-business” and destroys the rights of all. The Tenants have to take some responsibility for their actions, and to force anyone to submit to credit agencies, is also a stretch. If the tenant can receive a receipt, confirmation, which they can provide, that could be usable. But to force another layer of steps, forms, procedures upon the landlords, while the tenant is presumed to not be able to take care of themselves, shows me one thing. You are creating laws to protect those here illegally, who do not necessarily know the language, and do not understand basic business. Further, while this body votes to “Hog TIE” our real law enforcement, enabling more lawless people into our state, it is</p>

	<p>tragic, and wrong to keep forcing the business owners to pay the price. Those in the low income brackets have ways to receive help, and assistance. It is not the job of the landlords to hold their hands. We are not attacking low income tenants; and I also agree that they deserve fair treatment, having been a single mom, I know how difficult it can be. But, this body needs to stop going over the edge to punish the citizens, and they need protection as well.</p> <p>The extra steps you are creating on landlords also feels like more discouragement to actually have landlords in business. You cannot just force all home/business ownerships to be destroyed for the "SMART/Not smart" large buildings to pop up, at the cost of real property ownerships, in a WEF Global Communist Style Future!</p>
Scott Berkman Against themselves	I hereby testify that I am against this. There are plenty of protections in place for residents/tenants. This will only hurt landlords for invalid reasons.

Kimberly Salinas
Justin Carter
7350-7360 W. 20th Ave.
Lakewood, CO 80214

Landlords

Opposed to HB26-1106

The response to cost of living increases and unaffordability is not to burden mom and pop businesses. This only worsens the outcome for both parties: small landlords sell to big box corporations, and the quality of life will plummet for the tenant. There are other ways to address living conditions in Colorado, but forcing mom and pops out of the market is misguided and will not achieve the goal of helping out renters.

This bill creates undue burden to landlords in the following ways:

1. Shifts financial losses to people trying to provide housing, which will in turn create higher rents the next year to offset the losses.
 - a. This bill materially lengthens the eviction process and thus creates financial hardship for small landlords. It may cause some landlords to have to sell if they lose enough money. This bill should not create property sales.
 - b. Additionally, for people wanting to move to that area, it will be highly restrictive as the bill forces landlords to house people who are not paying but intend on staying as long as possible.
 - c. This bill unfairly forces landlords to house people who are in violation of the contract they signed, and the state is aiding one side of this business relationship. Landlords are citizens too.
 - d. Landlords still have to pay banks the mortgage, insurance companies the premium, utility companies monthly usage, and the government taxes while the government is allowing the tenants to not pay.
 - e. As a small landlord, I lack the money to buffer this. We already suffered from the R.U.B. bill, causing us to post seemingly higher rents with utilities baked in, and thus we have had a unit vacant for 7 months.
 - f. Long-term housing stability requires maintaining rental supply, which depends on landlords being able to enforce contracts.
2. The Court Case Cap further adds to a financial burden for mom and pop landlords because it allows non-payers to live for free at the cost of other people. This loss of rent translates into restricting how a landlord can further improve the living conditions and happiness of their tenants.
 - a. Instead, the courts can create more stream-lined processes to decouple the two parties, allowing for another citizen to find housing in the area that would otherwise be tied up by the process and individuals who are not paying for space they are using.

- b. If courts need more time per case, the solution is more court resources, not artificial limits that delay justice.
3. The weather bans are too punitive and essentially make evictions for 2 seasons highly restrictive. Denver is used to snow, hence Colorado's Passenger Vehicle Traction Law (Code 16) regarding tires. Is it very common for people in Colorado to drive in snow and even when it is below freezing without snow. According to the daily temperatures for all of 2025, accounting for night time being the lowest temperature, 26.3% of days would be offline and people can't fix their situation, leaving only 74.7% of the days to help people find a resolution. This further adds to a back log that forces landlords to cover the cost of housing people who agreed to pay for the space. That is not the role of a landlord.
4. The removal of the appeal bond allows for a person to stay on a property for which he/she is not paying even longer with zero repercussions to them and 100% repercussions to another person, causing the landlord to lose even further rent. This bill could result in higher rents the next year for all residents and/or puts small business owners out of business, thus allowing for big corporations to absorb individual's property and most likely at a discount since the rent log will show non-payment for several months, and having a negative ripple effect on overall living conditions for Colorado residents.
 - a. This also makes it difficult for people to move into an area with the inventory tied up in litigation, and a person having to pay for someone else to live for free.
 - b. The bill should protect legal rights, not be used as a free-rent delay to the small guy.
5. Broad "excuse" standards invite abuse of people (landlords)
 - a. The excuses for not filing are not measurable. People can simply state they did not have transportation, were "unable to file electronically", etc. One cannot verify these excuses, making the abuse of this provision easy to exploit. These standards are subjective.
 - b. If there are issues with the website that have in fact blocked people from e-filing, then we need to fix the website so that both parties can come to a resolution rather than allow that to delay a prospective tenant from moving in earlier.
 - c. This provision would also create ambiguity and further delay in the court process.
 - d. Has this bill even defined how many times a person can use this excuse?
6. Tenants already have plentiful protections in their favor. Colorado has some of the most tenant-friendly legislation in the nation. Adding more layers only creates redundancy not fairness to other Coloradans (mom and pop landlords).
7. This bill creates the following:
 - a. Forces private citizens to subsidize housing
 - b. Most landlords are small and own 1-4 places, not large portfolios that would allow them to absorb losses easily. It could create a vacuum—making small business owners exit and sell out. This bill will reduce the number of small landlords and concentrate housing ownership in large corporate investors. I have certainly considered selling as each bill against me gets passed.
 - c. This also negatively impacts property managers and other ancillary business owners as a consolidation will also collapse the third-party service providers.

- d. Eviction becomes slower, more expensive, and uncertain.
 - e. Landlords will need higher deposits to protect them from these outcomes.
8. Housing policies should be funded by public programs not by forcing individual property owners to provide involuntary credit.
 9. I own a quadplex, and I rely on the rent to pay the mortgage, insurance and taxes. One person leaving means 25% of revenue is offline. I can only float it for so long, until I have to sell. The vast majority of landlords in the U.S. are small time guys, they should be considered when creating legislation. Additionally, we would like to see legislation that protects us. One such bill could be no taxes, insurance premium, nor mortgage payments are due during eviction and do not build up in the event a tenant doesn't pay. Or the government covers the cost of the lost rent to landlords holding 4 or fewer properties.