



Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

REVIEW CONSIDERATION DECISION

Dispute Codes: CNR

Introduction

The original hearing was heard on January 31, 2012, and the decision was issued on that same date.

Division 2, Section 79(2) under the *Residential Tenancy Act* says a party to the dispute may apply for a review of the decision. The application must contain reasons to support one or more of the grounds for review:

1. A party was unable to attend the original hearing because of circumstances that could not be anticipated and were beyond the party's control.
2. A party has new and relevant evidence that was not available at the time of the original hearing.
3. A party has evidence that the director's decision or order was obtained by fraud.

Issues

The applicant is alleging that she was unable to attend the original hearing due to circumstances that could not be anticipated and were beyond her control, that she has new and relevant evidence that was not available at the time of the hearing, and that the decision of the dispute resolution officer was obtained by fraud.

Facts and Analysis

The application contains information under Reasons Number 1, 2, & 3

Reason number 1

The applicant claims that she was unable to attend the original hearing because she was told by the RCMP and CISIS, to hang up as there was an emergency in progress; however she has supplied no evidence in support of this claim.

I therefore will not allow a new hearing under reason number 1.

Reason number 2

The applicant claims that she has evidence that the dispute resolution officer and the landlord were recording her voice and using that recording to trigger a computer to kill millions of people; however again she has supplied no evidence in support of this claim.

I therefore will not allow a new hearing under reason number 2.

Reason number 3

The applicant is claiming that there was no previous Order of Possession issued because the landlord could not get an order from the previous dispute resolution officer which the applicant claims was the landlord's daughter. She also claims that the hearing was totally fraudulent because the dispute resolution officer was already planning in advance to carry out her threat to kill people by triggering her computer to drop bombs during the recording of the hearing.

Again as in the first two reasons, the applicant has supplied no evidence to support her claims made under reason number 3.

I therefore will not allow a new hearing under reason number 3.

Decision

The application for review is dismissed.

The decision made on January 31, 2012 stands.

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: February 21, 2012.

Residential Tenancy Branch