



ANTHONY G. BROWN, MARYLAND ATTORNEY GENERAL

# PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Media Contacts:  
[press@oag.state.md.us](mailto:press@oag.state.md.us)  
410-576-7009

## Attorney General Brown Files Amicus Brief Urging Supreme Court of Maryland to Take Up HOME Act Appeal and Protect Fair Housing Rights

**BALTIMORE, MD (March 6, 2025)** – Attorney General Anthony G. Brown filed an [amicus brief](#) in the case of *Hare v. David S. Brown Enterprises, Ltd.*, urging the Supreme Court of Maryland to reverse the decision of the Circuit Court of Baltimore County and issue an opinion that protects the fair housing rights of Marylanders under the Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME) Act.

More than 200,000 Marylanders living in more than 101,000 households use a federally funded voucher to pay their rent. Thousands more use vouchers funded by the State. The vast majority of people who use a voucher are families with children, people with disabilities, and seniors. These groups are disproportionately impacted by income-based discrimination. Low-income persons receiving assistance pay 30% of their income toward rent and utilities, and the remaining portion of the rent is paid by a separate contract with local government agencies. Nearly 60% of non-disabled voucher holders have a working household member whose income is too low to afford rent.

“Vouchers can be a life-saving resource for Marylanders who would otherwise be homeless or do not have stable housing,” **said Attorney General Brown**. “The HOME Act protects people from discrimination, and ensures members of marginalized groups can live in a safe home regardless of how much money they have.”

The case of *Hare v. David S. Brown Enterprises, Ltd.* concerns an appeal from Katrina Hare, an elderly and disabled African American woman, who receives Supplemental Security Income and uses a Housing Choice Voucher to afford housing. Ms. Hare was denied housing by a landlord, David S. Brown, Ltd., because she did not meet its minimum income requirement of \$47,700 a year, even though her Housing Choice Voucher would have covered all but \$126 of rent. The Circuit Court of Baltimore County ruled in favor of the landlord, claiming the denial was not discriminatory. If the circuit court’s ruling is allowed to stand, these policies, such as the one employed by the landlord in Ms. Hare’s case, can be used as a mechanism to exclude voucher recipients regardless the tenant’s ability to meet rental obligations, allowing landlords to avoid the HOME Act and continue to discriminate against voucher holders.

The Attorney General's brief supports Ms. Hare's appeal and urges the Supreme Court of Maryland to rule that minimum income requirements illegally discriminate against prospective tenants with Housing Choice Vouchers. The brief details the legislative history of the HOME Act and the clear intent of the General Assembly to protect Housing Choice Voucher participants from the type of housing discrimination at issue in this case.

###

<https://www.marylandattorneygeneral.gov/press/2025/030625.pdf>