

IN THE MATTER between **NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, Applicant, and  
**WILLIAM HURST**, 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 **INUVIK, NT**.

BETWEEN:

**NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**

Applicant/Landlord

- and -

**WILLIAM HURST**

Respondent/Tenant

**EVICITION ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Pursuant to section 63(4)(a) of the *Residential Tenancies Act*, the respondent shall be evicted from the premises known as Apartment 116, 20 Bootlake Road, Inuvik, NT on December 6, 2013.

DATED at the City of Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories this 20th day of  
November, 2013.

---

Hal Logsdon  
Rental Officer

IN THE MATTER between **NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, Applicant, and  
**WILLIAM HURST**, 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-

**WILLIAM HURST**

Respondent/Tenant

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**Date of the Hearing:** November 20, 2013

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

**Appearances at Hearing:** Bright Lubansa, representing the applicant

**Date of Decision:** November 20, 2013

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

The respondent was sent a Notice of Attendance by registered mail. At the time of the hearing there was no confirmation that the respondent had picked up the notice but Canada Post confirmed that he had been advised by notice on November 4, 2013 that an item was available for pick-up. The rental officer attempted to contact the respondent prior to the hearing at his home telephone number. The voice mail confirmed that it was the number for the respondent. A message was left indicating the date, location and time of the hearing. As well, the rental officer attempted to contact the respondent at work and was informed that the respondent was at work but not immediately available. Again, a voice mail message was left indicating the date, location and time of the hearing and a contact number for the rental office. The respondent failed to appear at the hearing. In my opinion, there are sufficient grounds to deem the Notice of Attendance served pursuant to section 71(5) of the *Residential Tenancies Act*. The hearing was held in the absence of the respondent.

The tenancy agreement between the parties will be terminated by order on December 5, 2013 for repeated disturbance (file #20-13742, filed on November 20, 2013). In my opinion, the eviction is justified if the respondent remains in possession of the rental premises after that date.

---

Hal Logsdon  
Rental Officer