

**QUESTION #1****Correct answer: b****Reason:** Rules #4, #5, and #6 apply here:**Rule #4:** Differentiate Between Retaliation and Legitimate Enforcement**Rule #5:** Document Legitimate Reasons for Taking Adverse Actions**Rule #6:** Enforce Your Rules and Rental Criteria Consistently

Remember that you're allowed to enforce your rules against tenants after they exercise a fair housing right, as long as it's for a legitimate, nondiscriminatory purpose and you've consistently enforced those rules in the past. Requiring tenants to pay rent is clearly a legitimate and non-discriminatory purpose, and the property in this case has consistently, for over 10 years, evicted others for violating the policy. As a result, the eviction is justifiable and not a pretext for retaliating against the tenant for requesting an accommodation. So, b. is the right answer.

Wrong answers explained:

a. The reason a. is wrong is that tenants don't become untouchable just because they request an accommodation, file a discrimination complaint, or exercise another fair housing right. They still have to obey the property's legitimate, nondiscriminatory, and consistently enforced rules.

c. This choice is wrong because exercising a fair housing right triggers the ban on retaliation regardless of whether the exercise was right, wrong, or indifferent, as long as it was undertaken in good faith. In this case, the request for an accommodation precludes retaliatory action even if the requested accommodation isn't actually reasonable. Similarly, evicting a tenant for filing a fair housing complaint is retaliatory even if the complaint is totally baseless and false.

**QUESTION #2****Correct answer: a****Reason:** Rule #2 applies here:**Rule #2:** Don't Try to Keep Tenants from Exercising Their Fair Housing Rights

The FHA bans not just retaliation but acts to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with the exercise of a fair housing right. And that's just what the property manager did when he told the tenant not to tell anybody about the incident. While it might have been well intentioned, the instruction to keep silent interferes with the tenant's right to file an FHA sexual harassment complaint. So, a. is the right answer.

Wrong answers explained:

b. It's debatable whether the property manager was acting in the tenant's best interest in telling her not to say anything about just having been sexually assaulted. More significantly, b. is wrong because trying to stop a tenant from filing a fair housing complaint is illegal regardless of the motive for doing so.

c. This choice is wrong because the legal validity of the underlying fair housing complaint is in no way relevant to the ban on interfering with a tenant's right to file it. Again, it's the mere action of interference that determines liability.