



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes CNC, MNDCT, RR, LRE, LAT, OLC, FFT

Introduction

On July 7, 2020, the Tenants filed an Application for Dispute Resolution under the *Residential Tenancy Act* ("the *Act*") to cancel a One-Month Notice to End Tenancy for Cause (the Notice), to request a monetary order for damages or compensation under the *Act*, to request an order for the Landlord to conduct regular repairs to the rental unit, to suspend or set conditions on the landlord's right to enter the rental unit or site, for authorization to change the locks to the rental unit, to request an order for the Landlord to comply with the *Act*, and to recover the filing fee paid for this application. The matter was set for conference call.

The Landlord attended the conference call hearing; however, the Tenants did not. As the Tenants are the applicants in this hearing, I find that the Tenants had been duly notified of the Notice of Hearing in accordance with the *Act*.

The Landlord was affirmed to be truthful in their testimony and was provided with the opportunity to present their evidence orally and in written and documentary form, and to make submissions at the hearing.

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.

Issues to be Decided

- Should the Notice issued on July 7, 2020, be cancelled?
- If not, is the Landlord entitled to an order of possession?
- Are the Tenants entitled to compensation under the *Act*?
- Should the Landlord be ordered to conduct regular repairs to the rental unit?
- Should the Landlord's right to enter the rental unit be suspended or have set conditions?
- Are the Tenants entitled to change the locks to the rental unit?
- Should the Landlord be ordered for the Landlord to comply with the *Act*?
- Are the Tenants entitled to the return of their filing fee?

Background and Evidence

This hearing was scheduled for a teleconference hearing on this date.

Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that the hearing must commence at the scheduled time unless otherwise decided by the Arbitrator. Rule 7.3 of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that an Arbitrator may conduct the hearing in the absence of a party and may make a decision or dismiss the application, with or without leave to re-apply.

I called into the hearing, and the line remained open while the phone system was monitored for ten minutes, and the only participant who called into the hearing during this time was the Landlord. Therefore, as the Tenants did not attend the hearing by 9:41 a.m., and the Landlord appeared and was ready to proceed, I dismiss the Tenants' application without leave to reapply.

The Landlord testified that the Tenants moved out of the rental unit as of July 30, 2020, and confirmed that they did not require an order of possession.

Analysis

I find that the Application for Dispute Resolution has been abandoned.

Conclusion

I dismiss the Tenants' Application for Dispute Resolution 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: August 11, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch