

Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

<u>Dispute Codes</u> FFT, LRE, RP, OLC, CNC, MNDCT

<u>Introduction</u>

This hearing dealt with the tenant's application pursuant to the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the *Act*) for:

- cancellation of the landlord's 1 Month Notice to End Tenancy for Cause (the 1 Month Notice) pursuant to section 47;
- a monetary order for compensation for damage or loss under the *Act*, regulation or tenancy agreement pursuant to section 67;
- an order requiring the landlord to comply with the *Act*, regulation or tenancy agreement pursuant to section 62;
- an order to the landlord to make repairs to the rental unit pursuant to section 33;
- an order to suspend or set conditions on the landlord's right to enter the rental unit pursuant to section 70; and
- authorization to recover his filing fee for this application from the landlord pursuant to section 72.

Both parties attended the hearing and were given a full opportunity to be heard, to present their sworn testimony, to make submissions, to call witnesses and to cross-examine one another. The parties acknowledged receipt of evidence submitted by the other. I have reviewed all evidence and testimony before me that met the requirements of the rules of procedure; however, I refer to only the relevant facts and issues in this decision.

Residential Tenancy Branch (RTB) Rule of Procedure 2.3 states that claims made in an Application for Dispute Resolution must be related to each other. Arbitrators may use their discretion to dismiss unrelated claims with or without leave to reapply.

It is my determination that the priority claim regarding the One Month Notice and the and the continuation of this tenancy are not sufficiently related to any of the tenant's

Page: 2

other claims to warrant that they be heard together. The parties were given a priority hearing date in order to address the question of the validity of the Notice to End Tenancy.

The tenant's monetary claim is unrelated in that the basis for it rests largely on facts not germane to the question of whether there are facts which establish the grounds for ending this tenancy as set out in the Notice to End Tenancy. I exercise my discretion to dismiss the tenants monetary claim with leave to reapply. This was explained to the parties in great detail on four separate occasions. The parties indicated that they understood.

Further discussions between myself and the parties revealed that the tenant had moved out on April 28, 2020. As the tenant has moved out of the unit, the remaining issues noted on this application are dismissed in its entirety without leave to reapply. The tenant is not entitled to the recovery of the filing fee.

Conclusion

The tenants monetary claim is dismissed with leave to reapply, the remainder of the tenant's application is dismissed in its entirety 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: May 21, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch