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Tenants Without Rights: Situating the Experiences of New Immigrants in the U.S. Low-Income Housing Market

Mekonnen Firew Ayano*

Immigrants who recently arrived in the United States generally are not able to exclusively possess rental properties in the formal market because they lack a steady source of income and credit history. Instead, they rent shared bedrooms, basements, attics, garages, and illegally converted units that violate housing codes and regulations. Their situations highlight the disconnect between tenant rights law and the deleterious conditions of informal residential tenancies. Tenant rights law confers a variety of rights and remedies to a residential tenant if the renter has exclusive possession of the premises. If the renter lacks exclusive possession, courts typically characterize the occupancy as a license, treating the renter as a transient occupant with contractual rights and remedies. Situating the experiences of new immigrants within the low-income housing affordability crisis, this Article proposes that courts should steer away from considering tenant status and its associated rights and remedies as a function of exclusive control of the premises. Instead, they should enforce informal tenants’ legitimate interests, impose duties on those who rent out substandard units, and award damages when the rent paid is disproportionately high relative to the condition of the premises.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Saman,1 an East African immigrant who came to the United States (U.S.) about a decade ago through the Diversity Visa Program,2 lives with his three children, spouse, and mother-in-law in a Virginia county, in the basement of a single-family home. The basement has no kitchen or other facilities, but he has creatively customized a kitchenette, a bathroom, and a workstation for his artwork. Sebr,3 another East African immigrant, lives in the same house in a room next to the homeowner's bedroom. They share a kitchen and a fridge. The homeowner bought the house some years ago and relies partly on Saman's and Sebr's rent for his mortgage payment.4 Neither Saman nor Sebr have a written lease.5

1. Interview with Saman Tashale, in Washington, D.C. (July 18, 2019) (on file with author). [hereinafter Interview with Saman]. Names of interviewees are not real for privacy concerns.

2. The Diversity Visa Program is a random selection system that allows 50,000 immigrant visas annually for individuals from countries with low immigration rates to apply for permanent residence in the United States. For a discussion of the significance of this program for immigrants from African countries, see Andowah A. Newton, Injecting Diversity into U.S. Immigration Policy and the Missing Discourse on its Impact on African Immigrants to the United States, 38 CORNELL INT’L L.J. 1049 (2005).


5. In such arrangements the rents are paid in cash and the agreements are oral. Obtaining a written lease agreement would be costly for the homeowner and of little use to the renters, given their lack of language proficiency and the cost of legal services. See Curtis J. Berger, Hard Leases Make Bad Law, 74 COLUM. L. REV. 791, 817–18 (1974).
Such arrangements are hardly unique in the U.S. low-income housing market. Studies show that a steadily increasing number of people are living in communal arrangements—splitting apartments and sharing bedrooms—to cope with the lack of affordable housing. Social inequality, stagnant wages, and rapidly increasing rents have contributed to this situation. A household with two adults who work full-time at minimum wage cannot rent a two-bedroom apartment in Washington, DC.

Immigrants rarely find housing anywhere in the formal market, not only because they lack an adequate and steady income source, but also because they cannot produce a recorded credit history and confront various restrictive laws and practices connected to their immigrant status. Instead, they rely on their family, acquaintances, and other social networks to rent shared bedrooms, basements, attics, garages, and illegally converted units that usually are insecure and fraught with a variety of health and safety hazards. For many, living in such an arrangement lasts years and may never end for some immigrants.

---


Further, as a recent study shows, low-income renters pay exploitatively high rent for substandard and even perilous properties because landlords capitalize on their superior access to the law and market forces to extract above-market rents.12 Tenant rights law envisions a variety of rights and remedies for residential tenants, including warranties of habitability, warranties of quiet enjoyment, and other substantive and procedural rights that promote decent, safe, and secure rental homes.13 Federal and state fair housing laws prohibit landlords, real estate agents, and financiers from discriminating against renters because of race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin.14 Some state and local laws have expanded anti-discrimination laws to protect other social groups, such as domestic violence survivors.15 However, these rights are available only for an occupant who has exclusive possession of the premises.16 If a renter lacks exclusive possession, which is the normal case in shared living arrangements among immigrants, courts typically treat the arrangement as a license, which comes with contractual and common law rights and remedies that are substantially fewer than tenant property rights.17 Licensees’ rights are as good as the agreements and common law rules unless a legislative vehicle grants them greater rights than those of licensees.18 This means that renters residing in garages, lofts, basements, and illegally converted or other non-compliant units can be evicted by regulators enforcing housing codes or by the owner using self-help.19

Tenant rights law does not cover a recently arrived immigrant who rents a basement room in a single-family neighborhood and gets evicted because she tests positive for coronavirus (COVID-19).20 An immigrant family that is denied heating and cooling services in an unventilated basement has no legal recourse under tenant rights law.21 An immigrant sharing the living room with an apartment

19. A license can be revoked at the will of the licensor, and the licensor does not need a summary removal proceeding to deny the licensee entry into the premises. See Kimack v. Adams, 930 S.W.2d 505, 507 (Mo. Ct. App. 1996); Andrews v. Acacia Network, 70 N.Y.S.3d 744 (N.Y. App. Term 2018). Some jurisdictions require ten-day notice to evict a lodger. See Drost, 881 N.Y.S.2d at 844; N.Y. REAL PROP. ACTS. LAW § 713 (McKinney).
renter can be locked out because he came home from work late at night; or, an immigrant who rents a room from a tenant in public housing, not knowing that he could not have his mail delivered to that address, has no remedy under tenant rights law.  

Further, fair housing laws do not protect people in such situations because these rules stop, as the Ninth Circuit recently declared, at “the front door” of a single-family house or apartment.

Commentators have casually observed that the divide between a tenant and a licensee is anachronistic and fails to reflect housing realities in modern urban settings. A 1955 Note in the *Yale Law Journal* argued that the permanence of residence would be a better determinant of tenant status than exclusivity of possession and proposed that long-term residents be entitled to the stability of tenure, notice to quit, and other rights and remedies available under tenant rights law. The issue recently attracted new attention in legal academia due to the steadily increasing number of renters who depend on shared or “communal living” arrangements outside the standard landlord-tenant relationship. For example, a recent article by Professor Shelly Kreiczer-Levy looks at informality in the U.S. low-income housing markets through the lens of property law and shows that the law does not confer legal rights on the steadily increasing number of American adults who are sharing their parents’ home because of the rising scarcity and cost of housing.

This Article extends the research on informality in the housing market to the situation of newly arrived immigrants. Drawing on sociological materials, interviews, and discussions with immigrants from African countries in Washington, D.C., from 2017 to 2020, this article shows the incapacity of tenant rights law to address the deleterious conditions of recently arrived immigrants in informal housing. The Article analyzes the precariousness of informal housing arrangements and proposes that courts steer away from considering “tenant” status and the associated rights and remedies as a function of exclusive control of the premises. Instead, they should expand fundamental tenant rights and interests to include renters occupying premises in an arrangement that does not fall under the standard landlord-tenant relationships. Courts should do this by imposing duties

---

22. *Id.*


24. 3 FRIEDMAN ON LEASES, LEASES, LICENSES, AND EASEMENTS COMPARED § 37:3, at 13.


on property owners to take account of the legitimate interests of all occupants meeting the criteria of “informal tenants.”

The term “informal tenant” is used here to describe a renter sheltered in a twilight zone of legality, outside the standard landlord-tenant relationship. The Article argues that informal tenants should have a legal right not to be evicted without adequate notice, the right to have adequate heating and cooling services, and other rights and remedies necessary for safe and secure housing. They should also have the right to damages when they are charged a disproportionately high rent compared to the condition of the housing. As informal tenancies have become ubiquitous, tenant rights law, which envisions landlord-tenant relationships narrowly and thereby renders the experiences of informal tenants legally invisible, needs to be adjusted to mitigate the precariousness of informal housing. Even during the COVID-19 pandemic, when federal and local laws have imposed a moratorium on evictions and provided other temporary relief to mitigate the impact of the pandemic, informal tenants are not covered by the legal safeguards which cover only formal tenants as defined by property law.\(^{29}\) Part II discusses tenant/licensee distinctions and demonstrates the narrow interpretation of residential tenants in tenant rights law. Part III reviews informal housing and factors driving informality in low-income households due to the current scarcity of affordable, safe, and secure housing, while Part IV zeroes in on the conditions that exacerbate these challenges for immigrants. Part V shows that while immigrants’ experiences broadly reflect the experiences of low-income social segments in the housing market, immigrants face unique challenges because of their triple status as renters, as immigrants, and (frequently) as members of racial minorities. Part VI argues that courts should recognize fundamental rights and legitimate expectations, such as the right not to be evicted without adequate notice and the right to damages for substandard housing, particularly when the informal tenant has been evicted without a reasonably adequate notice or paid a disproportionately high rent relative to the market value or condition of the property. The Article concludes by emphasizing the disharmonies between tenant rights law and the social realities of informal housing, and the need for serious attention to tenants’ conditions and rights in informal housing arrangements.

**II. TENANTS AND TENANT RIGHTS**

Modern tenant rights law is extensive and provides substantial protections; however, its reach is circumscribed by the law’s narrow definition of the term “tenant” in the landlord-tenant relationship. In each tenants’ rights case, the court must determine whether the landlord-tenant relationship exists based on elaborate criteria. The criteria includes: (a) whether the landlord has transferred absolute control and possession of a designated space to the tenant subject to rights specifically reserved to the owner and (b) whether the landlord and tenant have agreed to create an estate in the tenant either for a specified period that is less than

that which the landlord holds or a term that can be terminated at their will. Although the technical language or characterization used in the rental agreement is not dispositive, exclusive possession of the premises is the "principal test" used to determine whether the relationship created between parties is that of landlord and tenant rather than of licensor and licensee. This possession-centered, narrow conception of tenant status denies informal tenants the rights and remedies conferred by tenant rights law. The next section further discusses the tenant/licensee distinction, explaining why licensees have substantially fewer rights and remedies than tenants.

A. Tenant Rights as a Special Legal Category

When the tenant lacks exclusive possession of the premises, courts typically treat the relationship as a license. A license is a contractual "authority to do a particular act, or series of acts, upon another's land without possessing an estate therein." This legal category is traditionally applied to "[k]insfolk 'who are provided with board and the confines of a home'" and "non children real property occupants who are not on the deed or lease of real property," and people renting individual rooms. In urban settings today, license arrangements cover not only traditional transient lodgers and boarders, but also roommates not included in the lease, superintendents who are given dwelling places as part of their employment, students living in university or college dormitories, farmworkers housed by their employers, and many other dwelling arrangements that do not fall under the standard tenant-landlord relationship with exclusive possession of the premises.


37. New York law, for instance, defines a lodger “as a person who contracts for less than a landlord / tenant relationship” whereby the lodger has “unexclusive occupancy of real property” and the owner retains “dominion over the premises.” Hyland, 862 N.Y.S.2d at 816. Massachusetts law defines lodging as “a house where lodgings are let to four or more persons not within the second degree of kindred to the person conducting it, and shall include fraternity houses and dormitories of educational institutions, but shall not include dormitories of charitable or philanthropic institutions or convalescent or nursing homes licensed under section seventy-one of chapter one hundred and eleven or rest homes so licensed, or group residences licensed or regulated by agencies of the commonwealth.” MASS. GEN. LAWS ANN. CH. 140, § 22 (West, 2021). Courts have extended tenant rights to occupants of dwelling units as permanent residence even when the agreement characterized the arrangement as “lodging” exempted from tenant rights law. See Thomas
In characterizing a living arrangement as a license, courts consider numerous factors that include whether the owner retained keys to the premises; lived on the same premises as the occupant; posted a doorman or desk clerk; provided meals, utilities, cleaning services, towels, linens, utensils, and furnishings; or held the premises out to the public as a place for travelers or lodgers. If these factors are present, the duration of the arrangement has "a heightened importance," because courts generally consider a short residence period, even with exclusive possession of the premises, as an indicator of a license arrangement rather than a lease. Thus, a person renting a vacation home for a short period of time is a licensee, even though the renter has exclusive possession of the premises for the period.

Tenant status as a legal category evolved in an agrarian economy, when it was not only assumed that “the land was the most important feature of the conveyance,” but also that the landlord and tenant had equal bargaining power. Traditional landlords had no obligation to the tenant for the condition, quality, and habitability of the premises. Agrarian renters took the land as they found it, bearing all risks associated with the property in accordance with the caveat emptor rule, which shifted “the responsibility of examining as to the existence of defects in the premises and of providing against their ill effects” to the tenant. The rules absolved landlords from all responsibilities for defective conditions and also from having to repair the premises, unless they contractually agreed to assume the responsibility. Even when a landlord agreed to assume the responsibility for the condition, quality, and habitability of the premises, a tenant had no right to withhold the rent when the landlord failed to fulfill that obligation.

While the doctrine of exclusive possession remains a key element in whether courts characterize a dwelling arrangement as conferring tenancy rights, the traditional doctrines governing tenant rights have changed in many ways. Modern courts and lawmakers considered the prevalence of asymmetric bargains between tenants and landlords in residential tenancies, professional specializations in modern economies, and the interdependency of life in modern urban settings and

---

v. Lenhart, 444 A.2d 246, 248 (Conn. Super. Ct. 1982) (holding that the plaintiff was entitled to protection under landlord and tenant statutes because the rental agreement described the parties as ‘lodger’ and ‘lodging housekeeper’ to avoid the application of landlord and tenant statutes).

39. Id.
40. Id. at 475–76.
42. ROBERT S. SCHOSHINSKI, AMERICAN LAW OF LANDLORD AND TENANT § 1:1, at 2 (1980).
44. SCHOSHINSKI, supra note 42, at 2.
45. Conradi, 209 P.2d at 498 (citing 32 AM JUR. LANDLORD AND TENANT § 654, at 515 (“A lessee takes the hired premises, in the absence of warranty, fraud, or misrepresentation, in the condition and quality in which they are. The tenant takes the property as he finds it is, with all existing defects which he knows or can ascertain by reasonable inspection. He takes the risk of apparent defects. As between himself and his landlord, where there is no fraud or false representation or deceit, and in the absence of an express warranty or covenant to repair, there is no implied contract that the premises are suitable or fit for the occupation, or for the particular use intended, or that they are safe for use. Any implied contract relates only to the estate, and not to the condition, of the property.”)
rejected the *caveat emptor* rule.\(^46\) For instance, the *Javins v. First Nat. Realty Corp.* court stated that:

The assumption of landlord-tenant law, derived from feudal property law, that a lease primarily conveyed to the tenant an interest in land may have been reasonable in a rural, agrarian society; it may continue to be reasonable in some leases involving farming or commercial land. In these cases, the value of the lease to the tenant is the land itself. But in the case of the modern apartment dweller, the value of the lease is that it gives him a place to live. The city dweller who seeks to lease an apartment on the third floor of a tenement has little interest in the land 30 or 40 feet below, or even in the bare right to possession within the four walls of his apartment. When American city dwellers, both rich and poor, seek ‘shelter’ today, they seek a well known package of goods and services — a package which includes not merely walls and ceilings, but also adequate heat, light and ventilation, serviceable plumbing facilities, secure windows and doors, proper sanitation, and proper maintenance.\(^47\)

Tenants today possess nearly all the rights and privileges one can have over one’s property for the duration of the lease, such as warranties of quiet enjoyment and habitability,\(^48\) protections against evictions,\(^49\) and nondiscrimination in the real estate markets.\(^50\) For instance, a tenant can sue for nuisance or trespass in her own name;\(^51\) she can have guests;\(^52\) she can sublet the property to others;\(^53\) she can seek compensation if the property is condemned.\(^54\)

The legal consequences of categorizing an occupant’s status as that of a tenant entail substantially different common law rights and remedies than are available to a licensee. A leading treatise on the subject summarizes the different rights and remedies attaching to tenants and licensees as follows:

A lodger is not entitled to the notice to quit that is the right of the tenant. The lodger may not bring any possessory action, as may a tenant. A lodger is not liable for rent but may be liable for breach of contract. This being so, a landlord who sues a lodger for

---

\(^{46}\) See generally SCHOSHINSKI, *supra* note 42, at 3.


\(^{48}\) *King v. Moorehead*, 495 S.W.2d 65, 75 (Mo. App. 1973) (“In every residential lease there [is] an implied warranty by the landlord that the dwelling is habitable and fit for living at the inception of the term and that it will remain so during the entire term. The warranty of the landlord is that he will provide facilities and services vital to the life, health and safety of the tenant and to the use of the premises for residential purposes. It is an obligation which the landlord fulfills by substantial compliance with the relevant provisions of an applicable housing code.”).


\(^{50}\) 42 U.S.C.A. § 3604 (West).

\(^{51}\) 12 A.L.R.2d 1192 (Originally published in 1950).

\(^{52}\) 30 No. 9 Quinlan, Landlord Tenant Law Bulletin art. 7.

\(^{53}\) 52 C.J.S. Landlord & Tenant § 31.

payment must seek to minimize his damages. Though traditionally a landlord was not liable to a tenant for repairs, he is so liable to a lodger.\textsuperscript{55}

In some instances, a licensee is afforded better legal protections than a tenant for injuries caused by the defective condition of the premises. While a hotel or innkeeper owes its guests a duty of reasonable care and is responsible for injuries caused by conditions of the property, the landlord is not responsible for injuries caused by defective conditions in areas within the tenant's exclusive control.\textsuperscript{56} However, some state statutes give tenants who are injured by substandard housing conditions the right to withhold rent or claim other legal remedies.\textsuperscript{57}

The tenant/licensee distinction raises important questions about the legal position of informal tenants. Does it reflect or adequately respond to the current social reality in the country’s housing market whereby a steadily growing number of people live in shared rental arrangements? Does the legal concept of tenant as a renter with exclusive possession of a definite place apply to renters in shared, informal housing? The next part considers the nature of informal housing and factors driving informality in the low-income housing market. Subsequent parts consider these questions more closely, discussing the extent and experiences of immigrants in informal housing.

\section*{III. INFORMAL HOUSING}

This part reviews informal housing and explains how the combined effects of stagnant wages, steadily rising rent, and restrictive laws and practices foster informal housing in the low-income housing market. Informal housing is often considered a feature of the Global South.\textsuperscript{58} Scholarship on informal housing in the U.S. has evolved beginning in the 1970s, when \textit{colonias} – informal settlements by largely Hispanic communities who built houses on untitled parcels along the U.S.-Mexico border without official permits, plans, and municipal services,– gained attention in the academia and policymaking scenes.\textsuperscript{59} At first the phenomenon was

\textsuperscript{55} 3 \textsc{Friedman on Leases, Leases, Licenses, and Easements Compared} § 37:3, at 11–12 (6th ed. 2017).
\textsuperscript{57} 1 \textsc{Tiffany Real Prop., Liability of Lessor for Injuries to Licensees, Invitees}, § 107 (3d ed. 2020); Melissa T. Lonegrass, \textit{Convergence in Contort: Landlord Liability for Defective Premises in Comparative Perspective}, 85 TUL. L. REV. 413, 425 (2010).
dismissed by policymakers and scholars as a replication of immigrants’ experiences from their home countries.\textsuperscript{60} More recent scholarship, however, rejects this view and the underlying assumption that informality is antithetical to the laws and functioning of developed capitalist economies like the U.S.\textsuperscript{61} Professor Duncan Kennedy noted that “[w]ith respect to the dimensions of legality/illegality and formal/informal normative ordering, the Unitedstatesean market is much more like typical third world metro regional markets than we United States analysts generally recognize.”\textsuperscript{62} Similarly, the late Professor Jane Larson argued not only that rich and democratic countries that dominate the world economy and politics have failed to house their poor, but also that informality is inherent in neoliberal economies, stating: “The colonias are a structural response to the globalization of the U.S. economy, and its parallel effects of diminishing wages for labor and discouraging public investment in both housing and income maintenance. As such, there is nothing either temporary or aberrational about this housing pattern.”\textsuperscript{63}

Sociologist Saskia Sassen situates informal housing within a broader sphere of “income-generating activities occurring outside the state's regulatory framework that have analogs within that framework.”\textsuperscript{64} Such activities include sweatshops that work in the shadow of labor law and regulations,\textsuperscript{65} or street vending in New York City that operates in the shadow of trade licensing and regulations.\textsuperscript{66} Like these other activities and practices, informal housing emerges and evolves in response to opportunities created and constraints imposed by formal laws and markets. Informal housing exists as a survival strategy adopted in response to intrinsic inequities and fault lines of neoliberal economic structures rather than the result of immigration or other extrinsic factors, and the logic of informality applies to those who strategically evade formal laws to maximize profit and wealth, as well as to those who resort to informal ordering as a survival strategy. In Texas, for instance, domestic rather than Mexican real estate developers drove the creation of colonias by exploiting laws that created opportunities to build and sell untitled, subdivided units.\textsuperscript{67} Women, immigrants, people of color, and other vulnerable social segments depend on informality as a survival strategy because the formal law and economy have excluded them.\textsuperscript{68} Immigrants’ experience is only a specific instance of renters’ experience in the U.S. low-income housing market.
Research in the fields of urban planning and sociology shows that informal housing in the U.S. is ubiquitous. Professors Noah J. Durst and Jake Wegmann show that housing units flouting planning and zoning codes, parcels lacking titles or permits, rentals lacking required formalities, and dwelling arrangements that violate occupancy and other standards pervade both urban and suburban locales across the U.S. A 2008 survey conducted in New York City found that between 1990 and 2000, approximately 114,000 apartments were not reflected in the official number of certificates of occupancy the city granted for new construction or renovation. It also indicated that after 2000, many more such “phantom apartments” were created. These included private homes cut into rooming houses, two-family homes with unauthorized basement apartments housing a third family, and commercial lofts converted to residential property without regulatory approval.

In some locales race and immigration shaped the legal and political conditions surrounding the development of informal housing. In Los Angeles, for instance, informal housing “began as an auspicious opportunity for working-class whites in the 1920s, took on patriotic overtones during World War II, and then was essentially racialized and criminalized by the 1980s when the area flipped from white to Latino.” However, after facing a severe housing affordability crisis, California today has a more receptive policy toward informal housing units. The state enacted a series of Accessory Dwelling Units Laws to provide an additional income source for homeowners and affordable housing for low-income renters. Other states and local governments enacted similar laws to change restrictive zoning and building standards, as well as streamline permit and licensing procedures for accessory dwelling units. Such policies mark a significant step towards regularizing informal housing.

Black Public Sphere, 103 YALE L.J. 2119 (1994); Manuela Tomei, Decent Work for Domestic Workers: Reflections on Recent Approaches to Tackle Informality, 23 CAN. J. WOMEN & L. 185 (2011).


70. PRATT CTR. FOR CMTY. DEV., CONFRONTING THE HOUSING SQUEEZE: CHALLENGES FACING IMMIGRANTS TENANTS AND WHAT NEW YORK CAN DO 21 (2008), http://www.maketheroadny.org/pix_reports/PrattCenter-Confronting_the_Housing_Squeeze.pdf [hereinafter CONFRONTING THE HOUSING SQUEEZE].

71. Id.

72. Id.


A. Housing Crisis as a Driver of Informality

The prevalence of informal housing in the U.S. is directly connected to a severe crisis in the low-income housing market. The extent of America’s housing crisis, which is particularly pronounced in major cities, is reflected in the intertwined problems of lack of affordable, stable, and secure housing.76 The lack of affordable housing units in locales that provide suitable access to jobs, schools, and other social services for low-income social segments is a driver of the crisis.77 While 12.5 million of the nation’s nearly 43.7 million renter households have access to 46 million affordable units, the 10.9 million extremely low-income renter households have access to only 7.3 million affordable rental homes.78 Low-income renters spend a large share of their income on housing, leaving little money for other necessities. According to the federal poverty guidelines, households spending more than thirty percent of their monthly income on housing are “cost-burdened.”79 But a recent estimate — from before the economic crisis onset by the COVID-19 pandemic —80 showed that 12 million homeowners and renter households were “severely cost-burdened,” spending more than fifty percent of their monthly incomes on housing.81 Seventy-one percent of the country’s 10.9 million extremely low-income renters are especially likely to be “severely cost-burdened,” spending more than half of their incomes on rent.82 As the following graph shows, whereas renter households who have “above-median-income” can afford and have access to 46 million units, 10.9 million “extremely-low-income”

77. See Quinn Mulholland, Transportation Mobility and Housing, NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE (Mar. 11, 2020), https://nhc.org/transportation-mobility-and-housing/.
82. NAT’L LOW INCOME HOUS. COAL., supra note 78, at 1.
The housing market in the U.S. is dictated mostly by a free market policy. The belief underlying this policy is that increased demand will stimulate investment in the sector. But the market supply has consistently failed to keep up with the country's low-income housing needs. Regulatory practices concerning low-income housing development pose major supply-side constraints on new housing developments. According to a recent report by the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University, "[t]he rising costs of construction, land, and labor, along with restrictive land use regulations, impede production of both subsidized and market-rate rental housing." Complex and costly exclusionary zoning laws and practices have also steered housing supply away from low-income

---

83. Id. at 4.
84. See David Harvey, Forward to RAQUEL ROLNIK, URBAN WARFARE: HOUSING UNDER THE EMPIRE OF FINANCE, at xi (Felipe Hirschhorn trans., Verso 2019). Globally, real estate industry investment is close to nine trillion dollars and in the U.S. one hundred sixty-two billion dollars. In 1978, the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Department had a budget of eighty-three billion dollars to provide public housing services, including limited equity co-ops with the support of cities and municipal governments for non-market solutions. The budget was reduced to eighteen billion dollars in the 1980s, and during the Clinton years, “a period of increasingly intensive neoliberal reforms, it was abolished entirely, along with almost any prospect of municipal support for non-market solutions.” Id.
households. Regulatory barriers and “not-in-my-backyard” (NIMBY) opposition to new housing developments have contributed to the challenges facing low-income families.

Another aspect of the affordability crisis is the demand-side constraint. As housing policy is geared toward homeownership and private sector developers target high-profit-yielding housing developments, low-income renters are priced out due to stagnant wages and aggressive cutbacks on social safety net programs. According to the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, a worker earning the federal minimum wage must work nearly 127 hours per week to afford a two-bedroom rental home, or 103 hours per week to afford a one-bedroom rental home at the national average fair market rent.

The Economist magazine recently summarized the phenomena as “property pathology” — “an infatuation with homeownership” rather than renting that is undermining “growth, fairness and public faith in capitalism”:

The soaring cost of housing has created gaping inequalities and inflamed both generational and geographical divides. In 1990 a generation of baby-boomers, with a median age of 35, owned a third of America's real estate by value. In 2019 a similarly sized cohort of millennials, aged 31, owned just 4%. . . . And homeowners of all ages who are trapped in declining places resent the windfall housing gains enjoyed in and around successful cities.

---


93. Home Ownership Is the West’s Biggest Economic-Policy Mistake, ECONOMIST (Jan. 16, 2020), https://www.economist.com/leaders/2020/01/16/home-ownership-is-the-wests-biggest-economic-policy-mistake. See also Arlo Chase, Rethinking the Homeownership Society: Rental Stability Alternative, 18 J.L. & POL’Y 61, 61–62 (2009). (“For more than 85 years, the United States government has promoted homeownership through mortgage programs, tax subsidies and popular rhetoric. . . . For the past 30 years, government programs and resources have largely ignored the other dominant tenure form—renting. This neglect of rental housing and rental households has helped create a troubling situation in which nearly half of all rental households spend more than the government recommends on housing, putting such households at risk of having insufficient resources for other necessities like food, medical care, transportation and education.”).
Varieties of federal and local low-income housing assistance are available. But they hardly match the demand, as only one in four qualified households receives any kind of public housing assistance. For low-income families, the increasing cost of rent and associated lack of stable housing not only divert money they need for food, healthcare, childcare, and other necessities — it has also worsened their health and wellbeing. These cost increases drive low-income families to live in substandard housing conditions, exposing them to health hazards.

While the high cost of housing affects low-income households of all races, racial minorities face severe discrimination. For a long time government agencies, banks, and financial intermediaries in the housing market “redlined” racial minority neighborhoods to refuse lending for residents. Studies have documented the structural forces fostering discrimination and racial disparities in the housing market. The real estate financing industry has exploited even housing policies and programs that are intended to mitigate racial disparities in the housing market by deploying predatory lending schemes with exceptionally burdensome loan terms. These practices have fostered a vicious cycle of declining property values and residential segregation, exacerbating the racial inequality already embedded in real estate markets.

Poverty in the U.S. has a racial face, affecting immigrants and natives and discrimination is not limited to private market practices. Laws and public policies have created and perpetuated persistent housing discrimination against African Americans. As Richard Rothstein has shown, seemingly neutral governmental policies, rules, and regulations have long underwritten exclusionary practices that segregate Americans along racial lines in the housing market. A recent report by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), concerning

95. Id. at 3 (citing Erika Poethig, One in Four: America’s Housing Assistance Lottery, URBAN (May 28, 2014), https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/one-four-americas-housing-assistance-lottery).
housing discrimination against racial and ethnic communities, shows that discrimination is common across American cities.® Regardless of class, white home-seekers are far more likely than Black home-seekers and people of other races to receive adequate information about available units, a timely appointment to meet with real estate agents, the ability to inspect potential units, and the time/ability to negotiate favorable terms of rent.106

B. Housing Insecurity

The affordable and fair housing crisis produces complex tenure insecurity, exposing a steadily increasing number of low-income households to evictions.107 For example, in North Charleston, South Carolina, there were 3,660 evictions in just one year—that is 10.03 low-income households evicted every day, or 16.5 percent of renters per year.108 Evictions in urban areas are not about the housing supply falling short of the demand. A complex and path-dependent phenomenon has produced spiraling effects of poverty among low-income households.109 These households frequently face unstable housing conditions due to poverty, and their unpredictable housing conditions feed into it, exacerbating a vicious, intergenerational poverty cycle.110 According to research on housing and poverty, the oppressive reality facing the poor in the housing market works as follows: if you are poor, you are likely to be evicted as a consequence of the steadily increasing gap between working class wages and rent.111 If you are evicted, you are not likely to find a stable place to live because credit history screening and eviction record surveillance work against you.112 Without a stable and decent place to live, you will not have a steady job or income to maintain your health because you need a place to live to be a productive worker. In addition, your children will not have reliable access to education and health services. Without proper education and health, they are also likely to be poor in the future.113 Hence, the

106. See id. at 39–64.
110. Id.
111. UNDP, Center for Housing Policy Looks at Mobility's Effect on Children, 39 NO. CD-8 HDR CURRENT DEVS. 11 (Apr. 18, 2011).
intergenerational cycle of poverty and lives and livelihoods on the edge of homelessness continues, especially for the poor-and-Black.114

Landlords evict tenants for a number of reasons, including delay or default in paying rent, reporting domestic violence, complaining about housing code violations, overcrowding (which could be as simple as having guests), and drug abuse.115 Some grounds are not lawful causes for eviction,116 but landlords deploy informal mechanisms such as the threat of eviction to coerce tenants to vacate their premises.117

C. Eviction Record and Credit History Screening

The immediate effect of eviction for low-income households can be homelessness. According to Matthew Desmond, most evicted families have no idea where their next home will be.118 Eviction can also lead to a record that will foreclose a tenant’s prospect for finding another rental house. Whether or not they win the dispute, tenants involved in an eviction dispute are often blacklisted in the rental market.119 Because landlords screen out tenants with an eviction record, a tenant involved in an eviction proceeding will have a near permanently tarnished record and markedly diminished prospects for renting a home in the market.120

Credit history records produce similar blacklisting effects.121 Realtors and other commodity vendors gauge consumers’ moral and financial prudence based on their recorded credit histories. In today’s economy, one cannot have a meaningful economic existence without having established a credible financial identity.122 Financial identity is legally formalized as an integral dimension of individual identity, and relentless technological surveillance works to make consumers “morally responsible, obedient, predictable, and profitable.”123

In the housing market, real estate agents and landlords look at credit histories to gauge a potential renter's likelihood of defaulting on her rental

114. See Been & Bozorg, supra note 86, at 1408–09, 1412, 1415–16.
115. Id. at 1413–15, 1430 n.75.
117. See Kennedy, supra note 62, at 80, 83.
Landlords use credit history reports with negative information dating as far back as seven years as a predictor to determine whether a rental applicant is a suitable tenant. More than seventy-two percent of landlords rely on credit history screenings, which shows that having a robust credit score is one of the standard prerequisites to rent a house in major cities across the U.S. Companies providing renters’ background reports advertise credit screening as a means to demonstrate that the tenant has a history of responsible borrowing and paying her debts on time and that she can afford the rent. Landlords set the required baseline credit score quite high and reject tenants with credit history reports containing “too many inquiries,” “derogatory accounts or public records,” and “insufficient debt experience.”

Even though credit reports can be inaccurate and difficult to correct, for many renters a lack of credit history or a bad credit score means that they may have no place to live. Dunn and Grabchuk reported that individuals and families in Washington denied housing due to inaccurate or misleading background reports lacked the practical means to correct them. Potential renters often cannot afford to pay the repeated screening fees demanded when they are forced to make serial applications in their quest for housing.

While technologies have revolutionized the ways rental housing providers deploy credit history to screen tenants by, supplementing or even replacing traditional tenant-screening tools with computer programs, many low-income citizens are “credit invisibles.” According to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (C.F.P.B.), about 45 million Americans lack either a credit file with a consumer credit reporting agency or enough credit information in their record to

---
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131. See id.
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133. “Credit invisibles” refers to people who don’t have a recorded financial history or scorable financial record. See Kenneth Brevoort et al., *Credit Invisibles and the Unscored*, 18 CITYSCAPE 9, 9–10 (2016).
generate a credit score. These credit invisible individuals are trapped in a ‘Catch-22’ that is hard to escape because they need credit to qualify for a loan.

The effects of having an eviction record or a bad credit history are not limited to one's rental opportunities in the private market. Housing agencies administering public or assisted housing programs also look at eviction records when screening out applicants for public or assisted housing. Federal housing laws explicitly authorize landlords to screen out tenants receiving housing assistance based on their credit history and other background checks. Only one in four among those eligible for public or assisted housing receive housing support, usually after waiting for years. A low-income family with an eviction record could be denied public housing assistance. Keeping renters' eviction and late rent payment history as key limitations on housing access in the private market is unforgivably rigorous in enforcing and reinforcing consumer surveillance in the housing market.

Courts have held that screening out renters who have a poor credit history does not trigger fair housing or anti-discrimination laws. But some states have introduced regulations to enhance the accuracy of credit history reporting used by landlords to screen out tenants. New York, Minnesota, and Oregon have adopted various statutes to promote the accuracy of credit reports and limited safeguards against their adverse effects. Unfortunately, such state laws are rare.

Credit history screening has severe consequences for new immigrants looking for housing. It effectively excludes them from the formal rental market which requires them to have a recorded financial history. Yet for the majority of renters, such a history is necessary to establish the address and income to open a bank account. For refugees and immigrants coming from developing countries, where
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the practice of recording financial histories is absent or uncommon, it is counter-intuitive that having borrowed money from a formal financial body and paid it off in time is better than never being indebted to such lenders.\textsuperscript{143}

Aside from “amenity migrants”\textsuperscript{144} and those who have an employer, a family, a sponsoring charity, or other means of arranging a dwelling place, few new immigrants are likely to have the recorded financial history or steady income source necessary to rent a home anywhere in a major city through the formal market.\textsuperscript{145} Only those admitted through overseas refugee processing agencies receive temporary "reception and placement" support that includes interest-free loans covering their transportation cost from a refugee camp to the U.S.\textsuperscript{146} Those seeking asylum on arrival may receive emergency shelter and unstructured support from communities and charities. For example, when Congolese refugees arrived in Portland, Maine, in 2019, they sheltered in a basketball arena converted into an emergency shelter.\textsuperscript{147}

For the most part, until recent immigrants find a job, save enough, and build a credit history that will allow them to rent a home in the formal market, they have to rely on their friendship and kinship networks.\textsuperscript{148} Instead of visiting the internet for housing advertisements, calling an apartment agent to inquire about open units, or dropping by an apartment complex for a visit, they search for a place to live by reaching out to their social contacts (often before arriving in the U.S.) or visiting a café or community center frequented by their kinfolk.\textsuperscript{149} This search frequently results in informal housing in single-family homes, illegally converted units, unventilated basement rooms, a shared room in a rented apartment, or a sleeping space in the apartment renter's living room.\textsuperscript{150} In places where the
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affordable housing shortage is acute, new immigrants may end up staying in homeless shelters for as long as two or more years.¹⁵¹

Even when immigrants succeed in finding work, they have difficulty providing evidence of a steady source of income.¹⁵² Landlords require such evidence and screen out potential renters with income that is less than three times the monthly rent.¹⁵³ Renters usually fulfill this requirement by presenting paystubs or employment letters, but these are rarely available for new immigrants, who have difficulty finding steady paying jobs before having a work permit and a place to live.¹⁵⁴ When they secure the necessary papers, new immigrants usually work in minimum wage jobs such as serving in gas stations, local convenience stores, and other service businesses that barely provide the income necessary to rent a safe and decent place.¹⁵⁵

IV. INFORMAL HOUSING AMONG IMMIGRANTS

As a consequence of the housing affordability crisis, about half a million people in the U.S. are homeless, and nearly twelve million are "cost-burdened" or "severely-cost-burdened."¹⁵⁶ Whether one is a member of a low-income household, a local youth, a migrant from another state, or an immigrant from another country, obtaining affordable, safe, and decent shelter as envisioned by tenant rights law can be nearly impossible. Affordable and secure rental housing is particularly scarce in cities where there are jobs, easily accessible public transit systems, and schools.¹⁵⁷ The degree of difficulty in securing housing varies depending on one's race and socioeconomic background.¹⁵⁸ Any low-income person seeking rental accommodation must prove a steady income source, supply a reference from a previous landlord, demonstrate a robust credit history, and have

¹⁵¹ See infra note 149 and accompanying text.
¹⁵² See infra note 149 and accompanying text.
¹⁵³ Interview with Addis Arga, in Washington D.C. (Jan. 5, 2020) (on file with author) [hereinafter Interview with Addis Arga] [Note: The name of my sources and specific locations of the interview are anonymized]. See also Comm'n on Hum. Rts. & Opportunities v. Sullivan Assocs., 739 A.2d 238, 251–55 (Conn. 1999).
¹⁵⁴ Interview with Addis Arga.
¹⁵⁵ Id.
¹⁵⁷ For further discussion, see CONOR DOUGHERTY, GOLDEN GATES: FIGHTING FOR HOUSING IN AMERICA XII-XIII (Penguin Press 2020); Evelyn Blumenberg et al., Transportation Access, Residential Location, and Economic Opportunity: Evidence from Two Housing Voucher Experiments, 17 CITYSCAPE 89, 94–95 (2015).
¹⁵⁸ See generally Andrew Hanson & Zackary Hawley, Do Landlords Discriminate in the Rental Housing Market? Evidence From an Internet Field Experiment in U.S. Cities, 70 J. URB. ECON. 99 (2011).
a clean eviction and criminal record.\textsuperscript{159} Compounding the housing market’s wage-rent gap,\textsuperscript{160} these requirements present particularly severe challenges for recently arrived immigrants, forcing them to seek shelter in the informal market.\textsuperscript{161}

Immigrant renters are more prone to live in informal housing, as they face severe challenges because of their triple status as renters, racial minorities, and immigrants.\textsuperscript{162} According to a study on immigrants' housing conditions in New York City, immigrants are more likely to pay high portions of their income for rent than native-born tenants and more likely to live in overcrowded, illegal, and substandard conditions.\textsuperscript{163}

Informal housing arrangements are often good enough for a temporary stay. An immigrant coming from a less well-off economic background may resign herself to sharing an unventilated basement or loft with ten other immigrants. A refugee from an overseas refugee camp is unlikely to think that an overcrowded, unventilated, and substandard room in a U.S. city is the worst place to live. However, as a citizen-to-be, anyone coming as an immigrant with big dreams and ambitions would certainly be disenchanted by the experience. Informally rented units flout building codes, occupancy regulations, and health and safety standards, and the tenancies in such units are tenuous, overcrowded, unsanitary, hazardous, and sometimes fraught with abuse and violence.\textsuperscript{164}
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\textsuperscript{159} See Laura Agudoni, The Requirements to Rent a House, SFGATE (Nov. 28, 2018), https://homeguides.sfgate.com/requirements-rent-house-38824.html.


\textsuperscript{161} While the low-income housing crisis is widely recognized, it is rarely one of the top issues discussed among housing challenges confronting immigrants. An exception is a body of scholarship that emerged in response to local ordinances deployed by officials to deter the presence of undocumented immigrants in their localities by tying rental regulation to the renters’ immigration status. These ordinances placed undocumented immigrants’ housing conditions in the country's politico-legal spotlight, resulting in federal lawsuits that produced mixed outcomes. Jenna Christophel, Immigrant Survivor Housing Issues, J. KAN. B. ASS’N., 87 Sept. 2018, at 38–39 (2018); Rigel C. Oliveri, Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Landlords, Latinos, and Anti-Ilegal Immigrant Ordinances, and Housing Discrimination, 62 VAND. L.R. 55, 59–60 (2009). The issues raised by those ordinances and the lawsuits raised have positioned housing in the intersection of alienage and property laws, attracting considerable attention among property law scholars and immigration law scholars. Allison Brownell Tirres, Ownership without Citizenship: The Creation of Noncitizen Property Rights, 19 MICH. J. RACE & L. 1, 52 (2013) (recounting property law's ambivalence toward alienage, argued that U.S. courts have failed to articulate a principled, rights-based approach to noncitizen property and proposed an increased and formalized protection for noncitizen property rights as a step towards humane treatment of noncitizens and modernization of property law). Bender, supra note 5. California, Illinois, and other states have also proactively legislated to secure housing rights irrespective of the tenants’ alienage status and prevent property from being weaponized in battles over immigration policy. See Illinois Governor Pritzker Signs Immigrant Tenant Protection Act into Law, 96 INTERPRETER RELEASES 1, 1 (2019).

\textsuperscript{162} CONFORTING THE HOUSING SQUEEZE, supra note 70, at 20.

\textsuperscript{163} Id. at 3, 14.

among recently-arrived immigrants.\textsuperscript{165} The U.S. may welcome immigrants, or it used to, "but its housing does not."\textsuperscript{166}

Since the late 1960s, when a new law discarded the "national origins" quota system,\textsuperscript{167} the country's immigration system and immigrants' racial, economic, and professional profiles have significantly changed. As popular culture depicts, immigrants historically assimilated into the U.S. economy and society by moving up the social ladder.\textsuperscript{168} This representation reflected the experiences of European immigrants, who faced on arrival a variety of social and economic barriers that limited their access to housing to rundown tenements in industrial towns before they eventually moved up the social ladder.\textsuperscript{169}

Recent immigrants are more diverse in terms of race, national origin, education, and other social identifiers than the pre-1960s mostly European immigrants.\textsuperscript{170} In 2017, foreign-born immigrants represented about 13.6 percent of the U.S. population.\textsuperscript{171} A quarter came from Mexico, with the next largest groups being from China (six percent), India (six percent), the Philippines (four percent) and El Salvador (three percent), with the rest coming from almost every country in the world.\textsuperscript{172} They have encountered a new economy and labor market. As sociologists Emily Rosenbaum and Samantha R. Friedman describe, "today's economy is shaped more like an hourglass, with many low-paying jobs requiring little education at the bottom, many high-paying job [sic] requiring advanced degrees at the top, and far fewer jobs in between."\textsuperscript{173} The middle range jobs have disappeared, presenting an insurmountable barrier to the prospect of an affordable, decent, safe, secure home and upward mobility in the economy.

Further, while Europeans experienced spatial assimilation, recent immigrants assimilate through "segmented assimilation," whereby structural factors such as race and economic class play a more significant role than individual
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qualities. While the European immigrants of the pre-1960s ascended the economic and social ladders in an immigrant-friendly law and policy setting, recent immigrants confront a restrictive law and policy environment that severely impedes their access to the formal housing market and integration into the broader economy and society.

A. The Public Charge Rule and the Immigrant Sponsorship Program

Over the last several decades, laws and policies concerning immigrants have created and fostered informality in the housing market. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 have restricted access to public or assisted housing to a limited category of "qualified aliens." This category includes permanent residents, refugees, asylees, parolees paroled for a period of at least one year, and noncitizens whose deportations are being withheld based on prospective persecution. Because of a chronic shortage, eligible and qualified immigrants rarely access public or assisted housing.

From an immigration law standpoint, the policy is to exclude those who could not afford housing from admission into the country. As a condition of admission, immigration law requires that immigrants prove they are not likely to be a “public charge” by presenting evidence to immigration officers showing that they have sufficient resources to support themselves when they arrive in the U.S. The public charge concept has played some role in immigration law since the late nineteenth century, but the idea that aliens must be self-sufficient was solidified in immigration law in 1996 and further extended in 2019 to restrict the admission of immigrants.

The public charge rule applies to all immigrants except refugees, asylees, Afghans and Iraqis with special immigrant visas, individuals applying under the Violence Against Women Act, Special Immigrant Juveniles, and the members of

179. See Ericka Petersen, Building A House for Gideon: The Right to Counsel in Evictions, 16 STAN. J. CIV. RTS. & CIV. LIBERTIES 63, 72–74 (2020); AURAND ET AL., supra note 78, at 10–12.
a few other categories. 184 In evaluating the financial circumstances of an immigrant, consular officers have some discretion. 185 Those who do not have enough resources may fulfill the requirement by providing an affidavit of support signed by a U.S. citizen who undertakes to sponsor the immigrant. 186 All family-based immigrants and most employment-based immigrants must have at least one U.S. citizen or permanent resident sponsor who has signed Form I–864. 187 This affidavit is mandatory and legally enforceable, binding the sponsor towards the government as well as the sponsored immigrant. 188 The sponsor's principal obligation is to provide "whatever support is necessary to maintain the sponsored immigrant at an annual income that is at least 125% of the federal poverty level annual guideline." 189 The obligation lasts until the sponsored immigrant is credited with forty qualifying quarters of work, which is about ten years unless the sponsor or the sponsored immigrant dies, the sponsored immigrant becomes a U.S. citizen, or the sponsored immigrant permanently departs the U.S. 190 The sponsored immigrant is not required to seek employment or other means of mitigating damage to seek the support from the sponsor. 191 Immigrants who are not legally required to file Form I-864, such as Diversity Visa immigrants, but who may be inadmissible on the public charge grounds, file Form I-134. This form is not legally enforceable. 192 But Diversity Visa and some other immigrants usually overcome the public charge requirement by having a sponsor file this form to show that they will not become a public charge.

The sponsorship program generates practices among immigrant communities that deviate from legal expectations. The law requires that the sponsor support the sponsored immigrant financially, by paying for healthcare, housing, and any other needs. 193 In practice, however, the immigrants’ family and the immigrant community in the U.S. do not expect the sponsor to fulfill his or her obligation. A generous sponsor might host a sponsored immigrant for a week or two. Well-off sponsors with children may provide housing and other benefits in return for
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domestic labor, especially when the sponsored immigrant is a woman. If a sponsored immigrant were to sue his or her sponsor and thereby violate the ethical norm that “you do not bite the hand that fed you,” it would be a scandal. A sponsored immigrant who complains against the sponsor would be shunned by kinfolk here and at home. Also, as those who are well-off among immigrant communities are usually expected to co-sign the affidavits, any such complaint would be an incentive or excuse to decline future requests. Thus, there is intense pressure against seeking support from one’s sponsor, and disputes involving sponsorship agreements rarely end up in court, except in cases involving spouses, which usually occur only after a divorce.

V. INFORMALITY AS THE ONLY ROUTE TO RENT A HOME

Discussions with immigrants and people familiar with their situation reveal that a new immigrant starts looking for a place to live by finding a contact who might have a place to accommodate her or be able to refer her to someone else. The referral process occurs within a community of common acquaintances or "home" places. One's social bond within such a community is indispensable to generate the chains of referrals leading to an affordable dwelling arrangement. The formation of socially "enclaved" immigrant settlements, often along the lines of ethnicity, partly reflects people’s dependency on social contacts rather than on the formal law and market in seeking accommodation. The settlement pattern of immigrants confirm the significance of informal, social interdependence for housing. According to PEW Research Center, almost half of the 44.4 million immigrants to the U.S. in 2017 live in just three states: California, Texas, and New York. California had the largest immigrant population of any state, at 10.6 million. About twenty nine million immigrants lived in just twenty major metropolitan areas. According to the PEW Research Center, African immigrants are likely to settle as follows: thirty-nine percent in the South, twenty-
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five percent in the Northeast, eighteen percent in the Midwest, and seventeen percent in the West.\textsuperscript{202}

Texas, New York, California, Maryland, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Virginia are home to at least 100,000 African immigrants.\textsuperscript{203} In Minnesota and South Dakota, African immigrants represent the largest number of foreign-born residents.\textsuperscript{204} The data below illustrates where African immigrants settle in specific counties suggesting strong correlation between settlement, social ties, and housing.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By State and County (more than 2000)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harris County, Texas</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>56,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx County, New York</td>
<td>56,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, Maryland</td>
<td>54,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County, Minnesota</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County, Maryland</td>
<td>51,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County, Texas</td>
<td>41,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County, Ohio</td>
<td>39,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County, Illinois</td>
<td>39,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County, Washington</td>
<td>39,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County, Virginia</td>
<td>39,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings County, New York</td>
<td>32,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County, Texas</td>
<td>31,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County, Massachusetts</td>
<td>25,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County, Georgia</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Migration Policy Institute*\textsuperscript{205}
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and County (more than 2000)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, Maryland</td>
<td>15,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County, Washington</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County, Virginia</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County, Nevada</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County, Texas</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County, Minnesota</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb County, Georgia</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria city, Virginia</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, District of Columbia</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey County, Minnesota</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George's County, Maryland</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris County, Texas</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County, Colorado</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett County, Georgia</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Migration Policy Institute

A. Specific Modes of Informality

Within such communities, informal dwelling arrangements can vary. In a common type of informal housing arrangement, new immigrants rent a room as a group from someone who owns a house or an apartment. These homes or apartments are typically not in areas zoned for such leasing arrangements, as they are in off-rental, single-family neighborhoods with occupancy and other local regulations. Specific rooms or spaces rented to new immigrants in such houses often lack proper ventilation, heating, and cooling facilities, flouting health and safety codes. As described in my introductory example, this type of rental arrangement is especially popular among new homebuyers, who use the rent to pay the mortgage repayment.

The homeowner earns rental income higher than the market rate because of the apparent economies of scale. Despite the resulting overcrowding, renting a place
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as a group works by lowering the rent per individual. Nonetheless, the total rent in such situations can be higher than the formal market rent for similar premises. A room that is meant for one person could be shared by several new immigrants. Location—access to public buses and transit systems—and the amount of rent per individual are the most critical considerations determining decisions to rent a place.

In such dwelling arrangements, the relations between the landlord and tenants are informal in the sense that they are unwritten and often violate zoning, occupancy, and health and safety codes. In theory, new immigrants dwelling in such arrangements can claim tenant rights as tenants at will—i.e., tenants in a lease that can be terminated at the volition of either the tenant or the landlord. However, when several new immigrants share the homeowner’s living quarters, no single tenant has exclusive possession, raising questions about the applicability of tenant rights. Further, because such units are often illegal, flouting building codes and occupancy permits, courts have sometimes rejected the enforcement of such tenant rights claims as “contracts with illegal subject matter.”

Another type of informal arrangement occurs between new immigrants and renters. This is exemplified by the case of Habte, an immigrant from Ethiopia, who rented a two-bedroom apartment in a private rental market with a friend and proceeded to host two new immigrants who were referred to him by an acquaintance. Habte did not conclude a rental agreement with them. Instead, he reached an understanding with them that they would pay a "fair" amount of rent in accordance with their income. Every morning the newcomers packed up their sleeping mattresses and stored them away in a closet, leaving no evidence of their presence in case Habte's landlord visited. When I spoke with him in January 2020, he was hoping that the arrangement would be temporary. As his guests worked most of the time, nights as well as days, their presence was not a serious problem except for occasional disagreements concerning the use of furniture, the kitchen, and the living room.

In this kind of arrangement, the renter of the house or apartment effectively acts as a landlord sub-renting a room or a sleeping space. The practice is prevalent and has many variations. Documenting one such variation among the Hispanic immigrant community on Long Island, anthropologist Sarah J. Mahler provides an ethnography of the encargado (“the person in charge”) whereby entrepreneurs among the Hispanic immigrants rent homes from white middle-class property owners and then sub-rent the houses to more recently arrived immigrants as boarders.
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This arrangement is generally akin to room-sharing. Nonetheless, immigrants who live in these situations have much less control over space than those renting from homeowners. In many cases, the practice of renting out leased premises to new immigrants raises questions of legality. Renters of a house, apartment, or room often do not have the authority to sub-rent the place.216 This is the case, for instance, for tenants in public or assisted housing or for a renter in a private rental market where subletting to multiple sub-renters violates local occupancy rules. One of my sources, Aman Maru, lived in a public housing unit that had a living room and three bedrooms on the second floor.217 The housing agency rented the house to AM’s sister before she moved to a different part of the town. AM rented out the three bedrooms to new immigrants and slept in the living room when he took a break from his taxi driving business. He advised his tenants not to have their mail delivered to the address and cautioned them that if anyone asked, they should never admit to residing at the address.218 He was wary of the inspections by housing officials regarding occupants and occupancies.

B. The Precariousness of Informal Housing

Informal housing is overcrowded, unsanitary, and fraught with uncertainties, insecurities, and sometimes abuse and violence. Even in standard tenancies, low-income tenants burdened with little education or language barriers are often uninformed of their rights, and so suffer numerous abuses at the hands of their landlords. They “may go weeks without heat or water, or their stairways and hallways may remain for long periods in dire need of repair.”219 Ann Aurelia Lopez documented a case in which a family housed as many as ten people in a deteriorating unit with less than 400-square-feet of living space, and another case in which a couple shared a bedroom apartment with eight children.220 In still another case, a couple was residing in a 300-square-foot unit consisting of a living room, kitchen, and a sleeping area, their three daughters sharing a hide-a-bed in the living room.221 A recent study concerning the housing conditions of Hmong, Latino, and Somali immigrants in the Twin Cities, Minnesota, reported not only that these communities experienced a pervasive lack of affordable and decent
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housing and faced severe overcrowding and discrimination, but also that race had considerable significance in determining their housing conditions. In the neighborhoods with Somali populations, a major concern was racial profiling and complaints by white neighbors.223

In some places, immigrants' presence creates tensions with homeowners who report housing-code violations, often stirring up racially imbued conflicts.224 In 2014, officials in Fairfax County, VA, reported that housing agencies received as many as 20,000 complaints per year, leading to about 9,000 investigations that included investigations into places that had been illegally converted into apartments or that were otherwise too crowded.225 Immigrants' tenure under such conditions is one step away from a phone call to a housing agency, since the law does not protect tenants in illegal units.226

Tensions between immigrants and low-income renters who are citizens sometimes appear on the legal scene, as the latter may experience conflicts with immigrant neighbors and sue the landlords. In Jarvis v. Burnt Mills Crossing, LLC, for instance, a "Black Native American" claimed that the landlord had violated his rights under the Fair Housing Act by refusing to renew his rental agreement because he had complained about “African and Hispanic immigrant tenants” making noise.227 In DelRio-Mocci v. Connolly Properties Inc., the plaintiff claimed that apartment managers sought immigrants as renters to avoid paying for the upkeep of the apartment.228 Although neither of these claims succeeded, they reveal horizontal social tensions connected to housing and immigration.

Immigrants often face abuse and violence in informal housing. Diversity Visa immigrants face particularly challenging conditions. One of my sources, Temeg,229 had a typical immigrant experience. When he came as a Diversity Visa immigrant, he lived with Tad, who lived in a rented one-bedroom apartment. Temeg slept in the living room while working at Dulles International Airport for over a year. He then moved to St. Louis, Missouri, where he worked as an information technology expert and sponsored his wife to come from Ethiopia. Now, in 2021, Temeg lives in Virginia with his wife and child. Last year, his wife heard about Chalag, a young man who had just moved to the Washington, D.C., area after an altercation with his sponsor in Michigan. Chalag is also a Diversity Visa immigrant and planned to settle in Michigan in the vicinity of his sponsor, whom he met through a family contact before he left Ethiopia. However, he left his sponsor's home after a short while because the sponsor wanted Chalag to marry and sponsor a relative of his who wished to emigrate to the U.S. Chalag refused as he had a fiancée, and the
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sponsor responded by withholding his immigration documents. Chalag now lives with Temeg and his wife in a room of their two-bedroom rented apartment, sharing a “modest” portion of the rent. In a process involving protracted and bitter negotiations with the Michigan sponsor, Temeg helped Chalag retrieve his Permanent Residence Card and some other official immigration-related mail that had been delivered to the sponsor's address.

Gender also plays a considerable role in shaping insecurities and violence in informal dwelling arrangements. Research on low-income women renters in U.S. cities suggests that violence is pervasive among those who face housing insecurity. For example, Professor Rigel Oliveri's recent pilot survey in Columbia, Missouri, found evidence of widespread sexual harassment, ranging from requests for sexual favors in exchange for a rent discount to unwanted physical advances and forced entry into the rental premises. If native-born citizens confront widespread harassment and violence in rented homes, it is safe to conclude that immigrants in informal housing with precarious economic conditions, social vulnerabilities, and extremely limited access to law and law enforcement resources confront pervasive harassment and violence. Selamawit's experience is a case in point. She emigrated from Ethiopia, and while her asylum application in the U.S. was pending, she lived as a roommate with four male Ethiopian immigrants in a high-rise apartment in Prince George’s County, MD. She made this arrangement with the help of her social contacts, as she lacked the steady income and credit history necessary to rent a safe and decent place. One of her roommates attacked her with sulfuric acid, resulting in severe burns to her body.

C. Claiming Rights in Informal Tenancies

Would the problems now facing informal tenants go away if state legislatures enacted statutes to collapse the tenant/licensee distinction and confer tenant rights on all residential renters? This section shows that the precariousness of informal housing is partly connected to unequal access to justice and other structural problems. Since housing informality operates in a twilight zone of legality whose inhabitants enjoy only ambiguous rights and remedies, conferring tenant rights on informal tenants could signal formal equality and produce important symbolic value. However, rights must be practically actualized by courts, government agencies, and a broad set of economic and social practices to be a means of
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claiming secure and affordable housing. And the practice of claiming tenant rights in the country’s low-income housing market shows that social inequality, unbalanced access to justice, and deep structural problems have marred the capacity of tenants to claim rights. These problems require deeper changes than conferring rights in informal settings.

To be sure, courts have occasionally protected the rights of occupants even in the absence of a standard landlord-tenant relationship or formal lease. In *Vasquez v. Glassboro Serv. Ass’n, Inc.*, the court ruled that a labor camp service company could not use self-help to evict a farmworker without a judicial process. In reaching its decision, the court relied on implied contractual rights and public policy considerations. In *State v. Shack*, the court ruled that property owners cannot deny a farmworker the right to be visited by a social worker and an attorney providing services on the premises. In *State v. Coles*, the court protected the privacy rights of an informal tenant, holding that “the formality or informality of a rental arrangement does not grant a landlord the authority to consent to a search of the tenant's apartment.”

Notwithstanding these victories, tenant rights and remedies lack practical force for a variety of reasons. One is the unequal power between tenants and landlords to claim rights in the legal process. ‘Landlord’ and ‘tenant’ are generic terms. A landlord can be an unemployed homeowner renting out a room or a multibillion-dollar real estate company. Similarly, a tenant can be a single, middle-class young professional or an immigrant living in an illegal slum rental, bed-sharing with fifteen others in an unventilated basement room. Nonetheless, abundant empirical evidence shows that landlords generally wield greater power to mobilize resources and win litigation. Professor Russell Engler’s review of recent litigation data shows that in high-volume housing courts, few cases go to trial. Tenants rarely have access to a lawyer, but up to eighty-five to ninety percent of landlords obtain professional legal representation. “The typical case pits a represented landlord against an unrepresented tenant.” Given the bleak chances of winning in court and the negative impact of having a record of eviction, low -
income tenants are unlikely to seek legal remedies for housing conditions that violate laws and regulations.

Further, courts require high standards to prove liability for housing code violations. To establish liability for injuries linked to unsafe or substandard housing conditions, the tenant must show that the landlord was affirmatively negligent. To win against a regulatory agency for such conditions, the tenant must prove selective enforcement or nonenforcement of regulatory codes and discriminatory intent. These standards are too high to provide a realistic remedy for housing code violations, even with legal representation.

The case of *Rosario v. Town of Mount Kisco* offers insights on the obstacles tenants face in vindicating rights and claiming remedies with respect to housing code and safety standard violations. In this case, Ramona J. Rosario sued Mount Kisco, a town located in Westchester County, NY, and her landlord for the wrongful death of her son, Haniel Reyes-Rosario, who died of burn injuries after being trapped by a fire in his rented basement apartment. The basement had no smoke detectors, fire extinguisher, or adequate emergency exit or rescue openings. Rosario claimed that the town failed to take steps to increase affordable housing, regulate the rentals of substandard buildings, and “prosecute landlords who charge unreasonable amounts of rent for unhealthy, unsafe and illegal basements, attics and rooms.”

This case arose against the backdrop of an earlier conflict between town officials and immigrant communities. In the 1990s, in response to tensions between immigrants and native residents, the town aggressively regulated occupancies by unrelated people and restricted immigrants from soliciting work. Housing regulation became the town’s leading agenda as a growing presence of immigrants, combined with a shortage of housing, “created the perfect conditions for landlords to demand high rents for rented basements, attics, and other rooms.” The policy led to lawsuits, and eventually, the town ceased the aggressive regulations following a consent decree. The plaintiff in *Rosario* charged that the town shifted its policy from aggressive enforcement to not enforcing safety and health housing codes, which contributed to the death of her son. She also claimed nonfeasance and affirmative negligence by the landlord for creating the dangerous conditions leading to her son’s death. The court ruled that she did not provide enough evidence to establish discriminatory intent on the part of the town or to
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establish affirmative negligence and exclusive control of the property on the part of the landlord. 257

Recently arrived immigrants living in an informal rental arrangement are less likely than low-income tenants to seek legal remedies for housing code violations or other tenant rights because of lack of resources, language barriers, and other vulnerabilities. 258 In theory, informal tenants can claim damages for injuries caused by the defective condition of a premises. The elements required to establish a property owner’s liability in such cases are lower than what is required for liability in a landlord-tenant relationship, because property owners owe a duty of reasonable care toward licensees or licensee’s guests. 259 But in practice, new immigrants are unlikely to claim rights against landlords because finding alternative housing is difficult, and language and lack of financial resources limit their ability to seek legal recourse.

VI. REGULARIZING INFORMAL TENANCIES

As immigrants' housing conditions are closely linked to the crisis in the low-income housing market, policies that address the crisis can also mitigate the housing problems facing immigrants. However, while everyone agrees that the challenges facing low-income people in the housing market are grave, 260 there is no consensus on the solutions. Those who advocate market-based approaches recommend deregulating the sector and giving incentives to private sector developers to address the lack of housing. 261 “Supply skeptics” highlight that luxury houses and apartments are glutting select neighborhoods, as private sector developers cater to middle- and upper-income people, sidelining low-income households trapped in a vicious cycle of poverty. 262 They argue that the housing crisis should be considered first and foremost a matter of public policy. 263 Some low-income housing advocates recommend increasing the supply of housing while simultaneously boosting the demand-side support programs to steer new housing developments and existing stock toward low-income households' needs. 264 The
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recommendations in this vein include regulating restrictive occupancy rules and local zoning regulation. But given the neoliberal political current and the clout of the real estate industry in housing policymaking, the kinds of significant policy changes required to develop a housing policy that addresses the needs of low-income people are unlikely to materialize. A country that has failed to house its poor, voting citizens is unlikely to house non-voting immigrants through the political process.

Even if radical changes in public policy are beyond reach, can tenant rights law be extended from its current focus on the rights of renters with exclusive possession of the premises to give meaningful protection for renters sharing shelters or living in a property violating housing codes and regulations? The conventional legal remedies proposed to address informal housing include regulation, deregulation, and regularization. While some studies suggest that deregulation is a desirable way to address the health, safety, and wellbeing of tenants in substandard housing, regulation has attracted more attention. A regulatory approach could prevent informal housing if regulators strictly enforced building codes and health and safety standards. Nonetheless, strictly implementing such common regulatory tools as “red-tagging” buildings that lack proper permits or violate health and safety standards, penalizing property owners, and expelling tenants in substandard housing, creates trade-offs. In particular, it risks disrupting tenants’ lives and livelihoods. Given the acute shortage of affordable housing, they would be exposed to homelessness if landlords were to respond by removing units from the informal market or hedged their regulatory risk by increasing rents. As Professor Duncan Kennedy explains, informality is sensitive to neighborhood changes resulting from "a complex interaction between the strategies of rival groups with conflicting interests." Also, as Rosario
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shows, regulatory agencies are not immune to pressures from the real estate industry and those with an immigration agenda.

As a middle path between deregulation and regulation, regularization could produce better health, safety, and security outcomes for dwellers in informal housing. An example of regularization is Larson’s proposal to regularize colonias settlements in Texas. Larson recounts the experiences of colonia settlers who were caught between the Texas legislature's well-intended efforts to standardize informal land and housing conditions and the cost of complying with those standards, which according to the colonia residents and low-income housing activists presented the choice between having a decent home or no home. To ameliorate this situation, Larson proposes “a progressive realization” of the standards, adopting the notion from international human rights policies and practices and marrying market and regulatory strategies.

Another example of regularization is Professor Kreiczer-Levy's proposal to confer the right to adult children to be consulted when their parents terminate their joint living arrangement. She draws on the reliance theory of property within a broader understanding of property as social relations to argue that adult children living with a parent have legitimate expectations that must be recognized by property law. Property law doctrines often protect reasonable, actual expectations that are based on informal arrangements rather than formal ones. Thus, a solution for informal tenants could be to impose duties on owners to provide adequate notice when they evict informal tenants and to provide safe facilities and amenities.

Courts can build on existing law and jurisprudence to mitigate health, safety, and security problems facing informal housing tenants. As in State v. Shack, which
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held that farmworkers have the right to be visited by health and legal services providers, even if the dwelling arrangement does not fall under the standard tenancy, courts could steer away from considering ‘tenant’ status as a function of exclusive control of premises and begin enforcing the fundamental rights and interests of informal tenants without affording them the standard tenant status. Such a shift could protect immigrants in shared residence against arbitrary evictions or other precarity associated with informal dwelling arrangements.

When people’s permanent residence is at stake, rather than a transient accommodation such as a hotel or lodging, protecting their rights in informal housing is essential. As the COVID-19 pandemic has made clear, while students and guests could leave for their homes when universities and hotels shut down their premises, immigrants renting living rooms and basements have been left at the mercy of their landlords/hosts without any pandemic-related “tenant” protection programs to assist them. Similarly, an immigrant sharing a room with a tenant in public housing has no legal protection. Other than charities that reach out to immigrant communities, there are no official programs that address tenants living in informal dwellings without formal tenant status.

To properly protect the rights and interests of renters in informal dwellings, courts could give less weight to the requirement of "exclusive possession" in characterizing a tenancy as a landlord-tenant relationship. They could respond to the harsh realities of sharing a home in substandard conditions by shifting the attention away from the physicality of the premises to a relational view of tenant rights. The law should value rent in residential tenancies according to whether the competing interest is a home, which is a basic human need, or a license that can be for leisure, convenience, or other transient use. If the law were to confer the right not to be arbitrarily evicted on a new immigrant renting a room from a tenant in public housing or in an illegally constructed basement of a single-family homeowner, she could have adequate security to work and transition into the economy and society. Such protection would be consistent with the idea of “home” as an interest that is more than capital and investment.

A. The Problem of “Unintended Consequence”

Extending tenant rights to include tenants living in an informal rental arrangement raises some problems. First, conferring tenant status in informal

---

284. Shack, 277 A.2d at 374.
287. For relational view of property, see SINGER, supra note 281.
housing arrangements could discourage people who rent out places to new immigrants. The renter of a one-bedroom apartment hosting an immigrant in her living room for payment might be reluctant to enter such an arrangement if she had to provide adequate utilities or could not terminate the arrangement at will. A homeowner in a single-family occupancy neighborhood who relied on rent collected from immigrants living in the basement might increase the rent or hesitate to enter the arrangement in the first place.

A more feasible alternative to protect renters in informal housing and gradually regularize substandard housing would be to give the occupants the right to claim damages from the landlord when the rent is high relative to the condition of the premises. By allowing a renter in an informal housing arrangement to recover damages for rents paid in excess of the fair market value of the property, courts could help to palliate the injustice of rent extraction in the informal housing and inhibit owners from renting out substandard and dangerous accommodations and overcharging new immigrants. Under existing law, tenants in premises violating housing codes and standards can seek remedies based on the doctrine of illegality or warranty of habitability. While warranty of habitability claims apply, where there is a tenant-landlord relationship but the premises substantially flout building, health, and safety standards, some courts have applied the doctrine of illegality to such situations on the ground that “no landlord-tenant relationship can exist where there is an illegal apartment.” Numerous courts have rendered a residential rental agreement “illegal and unenforceable” when the property violated a building code requiring a valid rental permit. When courts apply the doctrine of illegality to rental premises violating housing codes, the renter can withhold rent and claim damages upon terminating the tenancy. But she cannot recover the entire rent if she had a constructive notice of the illegality, as the landlord is entitled to a reasonable amount based on the specific circumstances of the case. The court in King v. Moorehead reasoned that:

We prefer to base our decision openly on the hard reality that if, under existing conditions, landlords were deprived of all rents because of noncompliance with housing codes there would be far fewer low-income housing units available—landlords would find it to their economic advantage to abandon their properties rather than spend their separate resources to restore them to habitability.
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Adjusting the doctrine of illegality, courts could protect immigrants paying rent that greatly exceeded what the condition of the premises would justify by allowing them to recover the excess amount if the accommodation was illegal and the immigrant was unaware of the illegality of the premises.\(^{296}\) This logic could apply whether the immigrant was living in an illegally converted unit, unventilated basement, or the living room of another renter. Renters in an illegal apartment would recover, for example, a proportional amount of the rent paid for inadequate water and electricity services against landlords who denied these services to save on their utility bills.

One concern raised by this suggestion is that landlords would exit the informal market if renters could claim damages. Awarding damages to an informal tenant who has paid high rent for an inhabitable basement could, in effect, amount to \textit{post facto} judicial rent control, raising questions about the chilling effect of such control on the supply and other standard economic analysis objections that beleaguered rent control laws.\(^{297}\) This remedy, however, would be more akin to redressing unjust or unlawful enrichment than to rent control.\(^{298}\) A judicial regulation of rent exploitation would be unlikely to produce a significant disincentive for landlords in informal market settings. Just as the court reasoned in \textit{Moorehead} with respect to tenants in a standard tenant-landlord relationship,\(^{299}\) courts could allow landlords in an informal rental arrangement to retain a reasonable share of the rent. After all, under existing local housing codes, regulators can fine such landlords for housing code violations, though they are often unable or reluctant to do so. Giving informal tenants the right to claim damages is unlikely to disincentivize landlords more than the existence of local housing codes, but such a right could inhibit the exploitative extraction of rent from informal tenants.

Another concern is that immigrants and other renters have minimal access to courts and legal resources. Thus, granting them legal remedies for exploitative rent
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for informal tenancies could have limited social significance even if the courts were to extend tenant rights. This is a form of the classic problem of the gap between rights as legal promises and rights as practical realities. Nonetheless, if renters in illegal housing could recover the portion of their rent paid in excess of the fair value of the premises, charities and advocacy organizations that provide legal services for immigrants and low-income households could extend support. In addition, the potential social force of a rule that protected informal tenants could potentially spur the bargaining power of informal tenants and deter landlords from charging new immigrants exorbitant rent for substandard living conditions.

VII. CONCLUSION

Tenant rights law evaluates the landlord's interest in rent according to whether the competing interest is a tenant's interest in a home or a transient living arrangement, such as for leisure and other uses. Residential tenants enjoy legal warranties of habitability and judicial protections against evictions, whereas licensees can be removed by owners entitled to use self-help. The condition of a new immigrant living in an informal arrangement is not transient. However informal and shared her dwelling place may be, it is her home where she cooks, eats, sleeps, gets her mail, and keeps her belongings. Unlike the hotel guest, lodger, or transient roomer, she is unlikely to have a home somewhere else. Yet, according to property law's conception of the tenant with rights and remedies, her legal status is tenuous, akin to a licensee or lodger with contractual rights and remedies rather than property rights. This legal disharmony traps immigrants in the inequities and fault lines of the low-income housing market, undermining their potential to work and become full-fledged members of American society. Renters in informal housing are factually tenants; hence they need to have some basic tenant rights by law. If courts would attenuate the primacy accorded to exclusive possession in characterizing a tenancy, they could mitigate the most deleterious conditions of informal housing. This Article has offered concrete suggestions toward that goal.