



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding LEWIS STREET  
APARTMENTS BROWN BROS AGENCIES LTD  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      MNDCT, RPP, MNRT

### Introduction

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

- a monetary order for the cost of emergency repairs and for compensation under the Act, *Residential Tenancy Regulation* or tenancy agreement, pursuant to section 67; and
- an order requiring the landlords to return the tenant's personal property, pursuant to section 65.

Landlord company LSA's lawyer and agent, landlord company BBAL's agent, the tenant, and the tenant's advocate attended the hearing and were each given a full opportunity to be heard, to present affirmed testimony, to make submissions and to call witnesses. This hearing lasted approximately 7 minutes.

Landlord company LSA's agent confirmed that her lawyer had permission to represent the company. Landlord company BBAL's agent confirmed that she had permission to represent the company. The tenant's advocate confirmed that she had permission to represent the tenant.

Rule 6.11 of the Residential Tenancy Branch *Rules of Procedure* does not permit recording of a hearing by any party.

I explained the hearing process to both parties. Both parties had an opportunity to ask questions. Neither party made any adjournment or accommodation requests.

Pursuant to section 64(3)(c) of the *Act*, I amended the tenant's application to remove the names of landlord company RCCL and landlord company CCIL from the proceeding. Both parties consented to this amendment during the hearing.

The tenants' advocate confirmed that there were 21 different tenants with 21 separate hearing dates at the RTB, relating to the same landlords and rental property. She confirmed that some tenants would withdraw their separate applications, cancel their RTB hearing dates, and refile for a joiner of some applications. None of the other tenants were present at this hearing.

Both parties stated that they wanted to join this application with the other tenants, together with the same landlords, relating to the same rental property. Both parties confirmed that they intended to make a joiner application to the RTB, by consent.

The tenant's advocate confirmed that the tenant agreed to withdraw this application and apply for a joiner of all applications, together with the landlords. Landlord company LSA's lawyer and landlord company BBAL's agent both agreed to same. On the basis of the consent of both parties, the tenant's application is withdrawn with leave to reapply.

I am not seized of this application or any of the other applications, as I have not heard substantive evidence regarding any of these files. Only service of documents and the above amendment were discussed at this hearing relating to this specific application only.

### Conclusion

The tenant's application is withdrawn with 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: July 09, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch