

Wednesday, October 1, 2025

Park Place CMU vs. Cheyenna Larsen and Jacob Palasek

Case #s 25-01499-GC and 25-01500-GC

Defense Exhibit and Descriptions

Defense Exhibits A:

These are pictures of the leaking and mold infested windows and the frames I the illegal unit rented to us (O-7).

Mount Pleasant City Code, Michigan Health Code, and Michigan Housing Code require that all windows be weathertight and free of mold.

These windows and frames were in this state before we signed the “lease”, and during our whole stay.

Park Place CMU claims that we owe them for damage caused by the leaking windows they refused to replace because they claim the leak was “unreported”.

Park Place CMU should never have rented that Unit (O-7) in that condition to us or anyone. It was an illegal rental and a human health hazard.

Defense Exhibits B:

These are pictures of the carpet taken right before I dropped the keys in the office drop box at Park Place CMU on 5/29/2025.

Park Place CMU claims, “*Carpet replacement due to numerous stains*”.

The carpet was NOT new when Cheyenna Larsen moved in some four years before the move-out date of 5/29/2025.

The carpet was light colored and, I assume, knowing Park Place CMU, it was the cheapest apartment “quality” they could buy.

The carpet was NOT damaged by us beyond normal wear and tear for the “quality” of carpet Park Place CMU purchased.

Landlords know they must replace carpet after a certain amount of time.

Defense Exhibits C:

These are the move-out damage letters sent to us by Park Place CMU.

The first letters were signed by the Property Manager, Kelly Lauria, stating that we did NO DAMAGES.

A week later we get a “revised” damages letter and suddenly Park Place CMU now claims that we owe them damages?

The “revised” letter was signed by a person who DID NOT print their name and is someone that DOES NOT work in the office in Mount Pleasant, MI.

I have asked several times that Park Place CMU’s lawyer divulge to me the name of this “unknown” person who claims that we now owe damages, and they are ignored my requests.

Defense Exhibits D:

These are messages (emails) to Park Place CMU, Princeton Management and their lawyers where I mention the windows not being to city code, not being weather tight (leaking), and infested with mold.

One lawyer wrote me a letter about my Google Review. The review included pictures of the mold infested windows in disrepair. He does NOT mention that in the letter.

One of the messages was sent THE DAY AFTER there was a storm (5/15/2025) where I mention:

“I told Park Place CMU about the windows more than a year ago.

The pictures DON'T LIE!

Now I have pictures of the water coming in and videos.

. . . .

Water is falling unto the floor.”

This storm dropped a large amount of water in a short time, and the master bedroom windows (WHILE SHUT) leaked large amounts of water into the plaster and damaged it.

The damage caused is the sole responsibility of Park Place CMU for their failure to keep their windows and frames to City Code despite being told that they are not weather-tight (they leak) several times.

It is NOT “unreported” when you tell them the next day.

Exhibit D-9 is an email sent to Park Place CMU that has links to two web pages I made. One page has picture of the disgusting moldy windows and the other with videos showing the glass moving inside the frames (not weather-tight). It was sent on 5/4/2025. Park Place CMU knows all the windows leak. That is why they replaced all three frames (11 windows total) after we left. Destroying evidence, are we?

The web pages:

<https://parkplacecmu.compudocgr.com/videos.html>

<https://parkplacecmu.compudocgr.com/pictures.html>

Defense Exhibits E:

Pictures and videos of the storm that caused damage to the wall while it happened on 5/15/2025. It was the ONLY time I saw it leak in that room with the windows shut and I reported it the very next day. There was no “unreported” leak. The damage is the sole responsibility of Park Place CMU for NOT keeping their windows to the city code (weather-tight). Park Place CMU was warned and chose to do NOTHING to replace the windows, the frames, and remove the mold infestation.

LINK TO THE VIDEOS AND PICTURES:

<https://parkplacecmu.compudocgr.com/def-exhibits/e-storm-media/>

Defense Exhibits F:

These are the original pictures of the carpet taken on the last day we were in the apartment. Which was 5/29/2025 at approximately 7:00PM.

Located here:

<https://parkplacecmu.compudocgr.com/def-exhibits/f-carpet-exif/>

The pictures contain the EXIF data which contains (among other things):

- What device the pictures were taken with
- The time the pictures were taken.
- And the GPS coordinates where they were taken.

These can be freely examined.

I asked for digital copies of the pictures the plaintiff is going to use as evidence, but they have not given me access to nor even a printed copy, as of 10/02/2025.

Park Place CMU, is dishonest. They have many opportunities to fake pictures. How many times do people move out? Does Park Place save bad pictures for those that they do not like? There is AT LEAST one unit in each of the fifteen buildings configured EXACTLY like ours.

How will they prove that their pictures are NOT fake (of some other building)? Since I know they do not like me, because I am a “troublemaker” for reporting them for code violations, what is to stop them from damaging the carpet after we left and blaming us for it?

I mean, they already sent a letter saying we did NO DAMAGE then suddenly a week later they sent a letter saying we did, why is that? If they have pictures of the carpet I wonder what day they were taken?

How long after we moved out? And were they take after they remodeled and replaced all the windows? Did the contractors make a mess and Park Place blamed us for it to get carpet paid for? I wonder why they will not let me have copies of the pictures they plan to use in court.

Defense Exhibit G:

This is the EXIF data from one of the carpet pictures, showing the time, date, what device the picture was taken with, and where it was taken (GPS)

Defense Exhibit H:

There was a housing inspection on 5/6/2025. That is 23 days before we moved out on 5/29/2025.

The “inspector” noted ONLY a cracked light switch plate in the bathroom. The “inspector” did NOT report damage to ANY walls. There were no remarks about the carpet having “numerous stains throughout” or that the carpet was in horrible condition.

Cheyenna has lived there are, at that time, for four years and has never failed a housing inspection or had a “lease” violation for excessive carpet damage. There are two inspections a year so that makes eight that she passed.

If they inspect for the “obvious” and “general” housekeeping then if the carpet was so horrible it just had to be replaced, why was there never a notice about the carpet? Why no lease violations on the carpet?

The fact that the inspector reported NO DAMAGE to ANY walls on 5/6/2025 means that the damage happened after the inspection, but before 5/29/2025.

Park Place CMU claims we owe them simply because they claim that this leak was “unreported” and NOT because there was damage. It was reported to them that the windows leak several times before 5/6/2025 and twice after (within two days of when happened on 5/15/2025)

Defense Exhibit I:

Park Place CMU claims that the cost:

1. of the carpet itself and supplies (like padding)
2. the labor to remove the old carpet and dispose of it
3. and the labor to install the new carpet

Was $\$99.56 \times 2 = \199.12

I wonder what part of the above was labor and what part was the carpet and supplies?

Park Place CMU to have an invoice from Sherwin Williams Carpets, it is for \$199.12?

Did they get it removed and installed for free?

How many other invoices do you think Park Place CMU has?

The fact that Park Place CMU has an invoice does not PROVE we caused any damage over normal wear and tear for light colored cheap carpet that was more than four years old.

Minimum wage in Michigan is \$12.48 per hour.

How many hours did it take to remove the old carpet, throw it away, and install the new carpet?

The GAAP principle of accounting states that you must include the cost of the carpet, supplies, and labor.

Park Place CMU is dishonest, I wonder if the person that changed the damage list to state that we did damage did not know how much carpet and labor cost when they made up that number?