

Tuesday, September 30, 2025

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

Park Place CMU vs Cheyenna Larsen and Jacob Palasek

Replies to Plaintiff's Interrogation Questions

Response 1:

I entered a VOID contract with Park Place CMU on 6/1/2024. The unit that Park Place CMU rented to us was an "illegal unit". The contract (lease) was against the law and public policy, and it is therefore VOID. The unit (O-7) was a health hazard (windows and their frames were infested with mold). Park Place CMU broke server laws by renting the unit to us. The unit O-7 was NEVER to city code on 6/1/2024 and throughout our stay. Despite Park Place CMU being informed of the moldy, and leaking windows and frames several times, they did NOTHING.

Response 2:

I do not understand the lease. They are worded in such a way that the tenant cannot understand the Legalese language. They are [purposely worded that way so that the tenant does not understand it completely. Also, the property manager said, "You do not have to read it all, let me explain it to you..."

Response 3:

Yes, we were the only ones that live there.

Response 4:

DENY, see 4 above. The lease is VOID.

Response 5:

DENY, we vacated on 5/29/2025.

Response 6:

DENY, there were NOT numerous stains throughout. The carpet was MORE than 4 years old. It was NOT new when Cheyenna Larsen moved in about four years ago. I do NOT admit what it cost as you could make up any number and tell me that it cost that amount and what could I say? However, I am VERY suspicious of the amount claimed as NO ONE could (or would) have been able to remove that old carpet, throw that away, and install new carpet for the ridiculous amount claimed. I DO NOT care what you claim you paid. It did NOT need to be replaced. It WAS NOT damaged any more than normal wear and tear on four year old CHEAP apartment carpet.

Response 7:

DENY. The damage happened on 5/15/2025. That night there was a violent storm, and a large amount of water fell. While the windows were CLOSED, the water poured in and damaged the dry wall. The amount you claim it costs does not matter to me. You could say it cost anything. The ACTUAL claim on the COMPLAINT says “unreported leak”. Not that there was a leak and that there was no damage. But that claim is that we owe for the damage because we did not report the leak. I have sent several emails to Park Place CMU telling them that their windows are NOT to the city code (leaking, not weather-tight, mold infested, etc.) long before the damage happened and they did NOTHING. The sole fault for the damage from the leak is Park Place CMU’s alone. They were warned SEVERAL times about the windows and did nothing.

I see they replaced all the windows and the frames after we left, I wonder why? I also see that Park Place CMU DID NOT charge us for replacing all three windows frames (11 windows total). I wonder why? They must KNOW the disgusting state of the windows was NOT our fault but theirs.

Furthermore, the VERY next day (5/16/2025) I emailed Park Place CMU and Princeton Management telling them about the water that is flowing over the window seals (see evidence). Once again, Park Place CMY did NOTHING. It seems they are more concerned with a cracked light switch plate than a human health hazard.

Response 8:

DENY, see above.

Request 9:

This information is NOT relevant to the case and Park Place CMU already has that information. It is given to them when you apply (they should know this).

Signed: _____

Printed: Cheyenna Larsen Dated: 9/30/202

Signed: _____

Printed: Jacob Palasek Dated: 9/30/202