



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding ZAVA INVESTMENTS and
[tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes ET, FFL

Introduction

This hearing was convened as a result of the Landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution, made on August 8, 2019 (the "Application"). The Landlord applied for the following relief, pursuant to the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "Act"):

- an order of possession to end a tenancy early for immediate and severe risk; and
- a monetary order granting the recovery of the filing fee.

The hearing was scheduled for 1:30 P.M. on September 3, 2019 as a teleconference hearing. Only the Landlord appeared and provided affirmed testimony. No one appeared for the Tenant. The conference call line remained open and was monitored for 10 minutes before the call ended. I confirmed that the correct call-in numbers and participant codes had been provided in the Notice of Hearing. During the hearing, I also confirmed from the online teleconference system that the Landlord and I were the only persons who had called into this teleconference.

The Landlord testified the Application and documentary evidence package was served to the Tenant by registered mail on August 16, 2019. The Landlord provided the tracking information at the time of the hearing in support. Based on the oral and written submissions of the Applicant, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the Tenant is deemed to have been served with the Application and documentary evidence on August 21, 2019, the fifth day after the registered mailing. The Tenant did not submit documentary evidence in response to the Application.

The Landlord was given an opportunity to present evidence orally and in written and documentary form, and to make submissions to me. I have reviewed all oral and written

evidence before me that met the requirements of the Rules of Procedure. However, only the evidence relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this Decision.

Issue(s) to be Decided

1. Is the Landlord entitled to an order of possession for early termination, pursuant to Section 56 of the *Act*?
2. Is the Landlord entitled to recover the filing fee, pursuant to Section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The Landlord submitted a copy of the tenancy agreement between the parties which confirms that the tenancy began on September 15, 2017. The Tenant pays rent in the amount of \$1,000.00 which is due to the Landlord on the first day of each month. The Tenant paid a security deposit in the amount of \$500.00.

The Landlord stated that she is seeking to end the tenancy early based on the fact that the Tenant has significantly interfered with or unreasonably disturbed another occupant at the residential property. The Landlord stated that she has received information from the building strata that the Tenant was observed on video surveillance, pouring water from a bucket at the front door of another resident's rental unit. The Landlord stated that she was asked by the strata to take action to deal with the Tenant as it appears as though there is a growing feud between the Tenant and the other occupant in the building.

The Landlord stated that she has not yet served the Tenant with a One Month Notice for Cause. The Landlord stated that the Tenant has indicated that she would like to end her tenancy effective September 30, 2019.

Analysis

Based on the unchallenged and affirmed documentary evidence and oral testimony, and on a balance of probabilities, I find:

Section 56 of the *Act* permits a landlord to end a tenancy on a date that is earlier than the tenancy would end if notice to end the tenancy were given under section 47 of the

Act. The circumstances which permit an arbitrator to make these orders are enumerated in section 56(2) of the Act, which states:

The director may make an order specifying an earlier date on which a tenancy ends and the effective date of the order of possession only if satisfied...

- (a) *The tenant or a person permitted on the residential property by the tenant had done any of the following:*
 - (i) *significantly interfered with or unreasonably disturbed another occupant or the landlord of the residential property;*
 - (ii) *seriously jeopardized the health or safety or a lawful right or interest of the landlord or another occupant;*
 - (iii) *put the landlords property at significant risk;*
 - (iv) *engaged in illegal activity that*
 - (A) *has caused or is likely to cause damage to the landlord's property,*
 - (B) *has adversely affected or is likely to adversely affect the quiet enjoyment, security, safety or physical well-being of another occupant of the residential property,*
or
 - (C) *has jeopardized or is likely to jeopardize a lawful right or interest of another occupant or the landlord;*
 - (v) *caused extraordinary damage to the residential property,*
and
- (b) ***it would be unreasonable, or unfair to the landlord or other occupants of the residential property, to wait for a notice to end the tenancy under section 47 [landlord's notice: cause] to take effect.***

The causes for ending the tenancy early, as listed above, are identical to the causes for which a Landlord can end a tenancy by serving a One Month Notice to End Tenancy for Cause. The difference between this process and a determination on whether the Landlord has the grounds to end the tenancy for cause is that when a Landlord seeks to end the tenancy earlier than would occur had a One Month Notice to End Tenancy for Cause been served, the Landlord must also prove that it would be unreasonable or unfair to the Landlord or other occupants to wait for the One Month Notice to End

Tenancy for Cause to take effect. In other words, the situation created by the Tenant must be extreme and require immediate action.

In this case, the Landlord has applied for an order of possession to end the tenancy early based on immediate and severe risk. During the hearing, the Landlord stated that she is seeking to end the tenancy early after viewing a video of the Tenant pouring water at another occupant's door. The Landlord stated that the strata have asked her to take action following the incident.

Based on the testimony and evidence before me, I am not satisfied that the situation is so urgent that it should end earlier than a One Month Notice to End Tenancy for Cause would normally take effect. I find that the Landlord failed to provide sufficient evidence that this tenancy should end pursuant to Section 56 of the Act.

In light of the above, I dismiss the Landlord's Application, without leave to reapply.

As the Landlord was not successful with their Application, the Landlord is not entitled to recover the filing fee from the Tenant.

Conclusion

The Landlord has insufficient evidence to prove that the tenancy should end earlier under section 56. The tenancy will continue until ended in accordance with the Act.

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: September 03, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch