

IN THE MATTER between **NWT HOUSING CORPORATION**, Applicant, and  
**DALE MOSES**, Respondent;

AND IN THE MATTER of the **Residential Tenancies Act** R.S.N.W.T. 1988, Chapter  
R-5 (the "Act") and amendments thereto;

AND IN THE MATTER of a Hearing before, **HAL LOGSDON**, Rental Officer,  
regarding the rental premises at **FORT SIMPSON, NT.**

BETWEEN:

**NWT HOUSING CORPORATION**

Applicant/Landlord

- and -

**DALE MOSES**

Respondent/Tenant

**ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The application is dismissed.

DATED at the City of Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories this 6th day of January,  
2015.

---

Hal Logsdon  
Rental Officer

IN THE MATTER between **NWT HOUSING CORPORATION**, Applicant, and  
**DALE MOSES**, Respondent.

AND IN THE MATTER of the **Residential Tenancies Act** R.S.N.W.T. 1988, Chapter  
R-5 (the "Act");

AND IN THE MATTER of a Hearing before **Hal Logsdon**, Rental Officer.

BETWEEN:

**NWT HOUSING CORPORATION**

Applicant/Landlord

-and-

**DALE MOSES**

Respondent/Tenant

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**Date of the Hearing:** December 18, 2014

**Place of the Hearing:** Yellowknife, NT via teleconference

**Appearances at Hearing:** Betty Hardisty, representing the applicant  
Dale Moses, respondent

**Date of Decision:** December 18, 2014

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

This application was filed on October 29, 2014 seeking an order requiring the respondent to pay alleged rent arrears and repair costs totalling \$2388.51. The premises are subsidized public housing. The applicant testified that the tenancy agreement was terminated in February, 2012.

Section 68 of the *Residential Tenancies Act* requires that an application be made within six months.

**68. (1) An application by a landlord or a tenant to a rental officer must be made within six months after the breach of an obligation under this Act or the tenancy agreement or the situation referred to in the application arose.**

Although the Act permits a rental officer to grant leave to extend the time limitation set out in section 68(1), it has been the practice of this tribunal to do so only when there is a valid reason why the application could not have been made earlier. In this case, the applicant stated that they knew the whereabouts of the respondent and called him numerous times without any response. There is no evidence to suggest that any payment arrangement was made nor does the ledger indicate that any payments were made after the respondent gave up possession. Certainly the applicant had no reason to believe that this matter would be resolved without resorting to legal action.

In my opinion, there is no reason why an application could not have been made within the time limitation set out in the Act. Consequently, leave to extend the time limitation is denied and the

application shall be dismissed.

---

Hal Logsdon  
Rental Officer