



# Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## REVIEW CONSIDERATION DECISION

Dispute Codes: CNR O OLC

### Introduction

The original hearing was held on March 27, 2012 and a decision orders were 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

Whether or not there is new and relevant evidence that was not available at the time of the original hearing.

### Facts and Analysis

The application contains information under Reasons Number 2

The applicants state "we have proof and witnesses that were present when we paid our rent and testimony".

The legal test for fresh evidence was referred to in *Gallupe v. Birch* (April 30, 1998) Doc. Victoria 972849 (BCSC), wherein the test established by *R. v. Palmer* [1980] 1 SCR 759 was approved ,and is stated to be as follows:

1. 1. the evidence should generally not be admitted if, by due diligence, it could have been adduced at trial, provided that general principle will not be applied as strictly in a criminal case as in civil cases;...
2. 2. the evidence must be relevant in the sense that it bears upon a decisive or potentially decisive issue in the trial:
3. 3. the evidence must be credible in the sense that it is reasonably capable of belief, and it must be such that if believed it could reasonably, when taken with the other evidence adduced at trial, be expected to have affected the result.

In this case it is my finding that the applicant has not shown that the “new evidence” could not, with due diligence, have been presented at the original hearing.

This therefore is not considered new evidence, but just an attempt to re-argue the case and the review system is not an opportunity for the parties to re-argue their case.

Further I fail to see how this “new evidence” would have changed the Dispute Resolution Officer's decision. The witness letter states that on March 2, 2012 the tenant paid \$575.00 to the landlord, however rent for this unit is \$1150.00, leaving \$575.00 still outstanding which is more than the amount awarded to the landlord by the Dispute Resolution Officer.

### Decision

This application for a new hearing through the review process is dismissed

The decision and orders issued on March 27, 2012 stand.

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: April 17, 2012.

---

Residential Tenancy Branch