

THE FIRE-HAZARD CLAIM — ORIGIN AND DISCLOSURE

315 N 12th Street, Unit 806, Philadelphia, PA 19107 · Prepared by Justin Horn · April 24, 2026

1. The claim to the guarantor (April 15, 2026).

Nicole Cordial, Senior Community Manager at Goldtex / Greystar, emailed Abraham Horn — Justin Horn's father and lease guarantor — a non-renewal notice. Justin Horn was not a recipient. The email states:

“... a recent notice from the city regarding the condition of his apartment. According to the information provided, the city has deemed the unit a potential fire hazard, which poses a risk to other residents.”

2. Suppression of the claim from the tenant, and disclosure by Rob.

Nicole Cordial instructed building staff not to inform Justin Horn of the fire-hazard claim. One maintenance staff member, Rob, disclosed it to Justin Horn despite that instruction, because he believed withholding it was wrong. Without Rob's disclosure, the tenant named in the non-renewal would have had no contemporaneous knowledge of the stated basis for that non-renewal.

3. Inquiries seeking identification of the hazard.

Justin Horn emailed Nicole Cordial multiple times asking what the fire hazard was. She did not respond. Councilmember Mark F. Squilla (1st District) formally asked L&I to address the concern; on April 24, 2026 he wrote to Justin Horn: “We did ask L&I to address and would love to know what the fire hazard is that is being reported.” No record of any fire-hazard notice for Unit 806 appeared in L&I's public-facing lookup or through 311.

4. The answer from L&I (April 24, 2026).

Anthony X. Williams, L&I Quality of Life Code Enforcement Supervisor, North District, responded in writing. The relevant language:

“There is no documentation or report of a fire violation for that unit. The inspector had a discussion with management around the complaint for the unit and other complaints at the parcel. ... At that time the inspector was asked if the storage in the unit could potentially be a fire hazard, to which he responded yes. The inspector did not deem the potential high enough to issue a violation on the occupant for the storage at the time of inspection.”

5. What this establishes.

No city notice exists. No violation was issued. No finding was made. The entire factual basis for the “the city has deemed the unit a potential fire hazard” statement in Nicole Cordial's April 15 email to the guarantor is a one-word affirmative answer (“yes”) given by an inspector, in a hallway conversation with management, to a leading hypothetical about storage — a question the inspector did not himself raise and a condition he explicitly declined to cite.

6. The pattern.

Management solicited the hypothetical. Management generated the characterization. Management communicated the characterization to a third party as a city finding. Management issued the non-renewal on the basis of that characterization — within days of the tenant raising habitability concerns, filing a police report, and being the victim-witness in an active criminal prosecution arising from an assault at this same address. The leading question to the inspector was the instrument by which a pretext was manufactured to support an otherwise unsupported non-renewal.

All quoted language reproduced verbatim from the source emails. Full email thread available on request.