

DECISION

Dispute Codes MND MNSD MNDC FF

Introduction

This hearing dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the Landlord to obtain a Monetary Order for money owed or compensation for damage or loss under the Act, for damage to the rental unit, to keep all or part of the pet and or security deposit, and to recover the cost of the filing fee from the Tenants.

No one was in attendance for the applicant Landlord however two respondent Tenants appeared at the hearing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the Landlord entitled to a monetary order under sections 38, 67, and 72 of the *Residential Tenancy Act*?

Background and Evidence

There was no additional evidence or testimony provided in support of the Landlord's claim as no one attended on behalf of the Landlord.

Analysis

Section 61 of the *Residential Tenancy Act* states that upon accepting an application for dispute resolution, the director must set the matter down for a hearing and that the Director must determine if the hearing is to be oral or in writing. In this case, the hearing was scheduled for an oral teleconference hearing. In the absence of the applicant Landlord, the telephone line remained open while the phone system was monitored for ten minutes and no one on behalf of the applicant Landlord called into the hearing during this time. Based on the aforementioned I find that the Landlord has failed to present the merits of their application and the application is dismissed.

Conclusion

I HEREBY DISMISS the Landlord's application, without leave to reapply.

This decision is made on authority delegated to me by the Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch under Section 9.1(1) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: November 02, 2009.

Dispute Resolution Officer