IN THE MATTER between **NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, Applicant, and **LANCE MAIR**, 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 **YELLOWKNIFE**, **NT**.

BETWEEN:

#### NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Applicant/Landlord

- and -

# LANCE MAIR

Respondent/Tenant

## **EVICTION ORDER**

## IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

 Pursuant to section 63(4)(a) of the *Residential Tenancies Act*, the respondent shall be evicted from the premises known as Apartment 106, 1000 Gitzel Street, Yellowknife, NT on October 16, 2011 unless rent arrears and the October, 2011 rent in the total amount of four thousand four hundred twenty two dollars and thirty six cents (\$4422.36) are paid in full on or before October 15, 2011.

DATED at the City of Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories this 30th day of September, 2011.

Hal Logsdon Rental Officer IN THE MATTER between **NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, Applicant, and **LANCE MAIR**, 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**:

### NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Applicant/Landlord

-and-

### LANCE MAIR

Respondent/Tenant

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

Date of the Hearing:	September 27, 2011
Place of the Hearing:	Yellowknife, NT
Appearances at Hearing:	Maigan Lefrancois, representing the applicant

Date of Decision: September 30, 2011

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The respondent was personally served with a Notice of Attendance but failed to appear at the hearing. The hearing was held in his absence.

The tenancy agreement will be terminated by order on October 15, 2011 (file #10-12263, filed on September 30, 2011) unless the respondent pays the applicant rent arrears and the October, 2011 rent totalling four thousand four hundred twenty two dollars and thirty six cents (\$4422.36).

In my opinion the eviction is justified if the order is not satisfied and the respondent remains in possession of the premises.

Hal Logsdon Rental Officer