IN THE MATTER between **NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, Applicant, and **CHARLIE PETER CHARLIE**, 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 -

CHARLIE PETER CHARLIE

Respondent/Tenant

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Pursuant to sections 43(4)(a) and 43(4)(b) of the *Residential Tenancies Act*, the respondent shall comply with his obligation to not disturb other tenants and shall not create any disturbances in the future.

DATED at the City of Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories this 9th day of July, 2014.

Hal Logsdon Rental Officer IN THE MATTER between **NPR LIMITED PARTNERSHIP**, Applicant, and **CHARLIE PETER CHARLIE**, 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-

CHARLIE PETER CHARLIE

Respondent/Tenant

REASONS FOR DECISION

Date of the Hearing: June 16, 2014

Place of the Hearing: Inuvik, NT

Appearances at Hearing:

Aru Vashisht, representing the applicant Charlie Peter Charlie, respondent

Date of Decision:

June 16, 2014

REASONS FOR DECISION

The applicant alleged that the respondent had breached the tenancy agreement by repeatedly disturbing other tenants in the residential complex. The applicant sought an order terminating the tenancy agreement and evicting the respondent.

The applicant provided a written complaint from another tenant in the residential complex dated January 31, 2013 alleging that fifteen people from the respondent's apartment knocked on her door on January 26 and entered her apartment when she opened the door. She stated that she called her mother who arrived with the police and escorted the persons out of the building. A notice was sent to the respondent on February 4, 2013 warning the respondent that further disturbances would not be tolerated.

Another notice, dated April 23, 2014 was served on the respondent noting "disturbances coming from your unit the past weekend." There were no details of the alleged disturbances provided in the notice or presented at the hearing.

A note to file dated May 13, 2014 noted that the landlord received a call the previous day to complain about a disturbance in the respondent's apartment.

The respondent disputed the allegations stating that the persons in the residential complex were permitted in the building by the complainant. He testified that the alleged disturbance on May 12,

2014 was just four persons in his apartment telling stories in the afternoon. The respondent had no recollection of any disturbances during the long weekend preceding April 23, 2014.

In my opinion, there is insufficient evidence to support a finding of significant disturbance. The applicant had no direct knowledge of the alleged incidents and the evidence, except for the January 2013 incident which occurred well over a year ago and is disputed by the respondent, are short on detail. I find that there was some disturbance on May 12, 2014 but it does not, in my opinion, warrant termination of the tenancy agreement.

An order shall issue requiring the respondent to comply with his obligation to not disturb other tenants in the residential complex and to not create any disturbances in the future.

Hal Logsdon Rental Officer