

IN THE MATTER between **Mary Corrigan**, Applicant, and **Satdeo Inc.**, 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, **Adelle Guigon**, Deputy Rental Officer,  
regarding a rental premises within **the town of Hay River in the Northwest Territories.**

BETWEEN:

**MARY CORRIGAL**

Applicant/Tenant

- and -

**SATDEO INC.**

Respondent/Landlord

**ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. This application is dismissed.

DATED at the City of Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories this 13th day of August  
2014.

---

Adelle Guigon  
Deputy Rental Officer

IN THE MATTER between **Mary Corrigan**, Applicant, and **Satdeo Inc.**, 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 **Adelle Guigon**, Deputy Rental Officer.

BETWEEN:

**MARY CORRIGAL**

Applicant/Tenant

-and-

**SATDEO INC.**

Respondent/Landlord

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**Date of the Hearing:** August 13, 2014

**Place of the Hearing:** Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, by teleconference

**Appearances at Hearing:**

**Date of Decision:** August 13, 2014

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

An application to a rental officer made by Mary Corrigan as the applicant/tenant against Satdeo Inc. as the respondent/landlord was filed by the Rental Office May 16, 2014. The application was made requesting the return of retained personal property from the rental premises known as #407, 3 Capital Drive, in Hay River, Northwest Territories. The applicant served a copy of the filed application on the respondent by registered mail signed for May 30, 2014.

A hearing was scheduled for June 19, 2014; Ms. Mary Corrigan appeared as the applicant and Mr. Malay Das appeared representing the respondent. The hearing commenced and arguments were heard, however, it became clear that required documentary evidence was required from both parties before the hearing could continue. The hearing was adjourned to July 15, 2014, with a requirement that any additional evidence be received by all parties no later than July 14, 2014.

A request for further postponement of the hearing was made by the respondent on July 8, 2014, due to a key element of his evidence being unattainable until the first week of August. I contacted the applicant to inquire her opinion as to the request for postponement, and due to her own personal matter which had arisen since the last hearing date she supported the postponement of the hearing to mid-August. I confirmed with both parties that new notices of attendance would be sent to them once I had set a new hearing date.

The new hearing was scheduled for August 13, 2014. Both parties were served the notice of attendance by registered mail. Ms. Corrigan was deemed served on July 30, 2014, pursuant to section 71(5) of the *Residential Tenancies Act*; signed receipt by her of the registered mail notice could not be confirmed prior to the hearing date. I attempted to contact Ms. Corrigan by telephone on August 12, 2014, to confirm the hearing date, time, and place; another party answered one of three telephone numbers provided by her and indicated the number was no longer Ms. Corrigan's and the individual had no knowledge as to her whereabouts; the other two telephone numbers provided by Ms. Corrigan were no longer in service. Mr. Das's notice of attendance was signed for July 30, 2014. I attempted to contact Mr. Das by telephone on August 12, 2014, to confirm the hearing date, time, and place, however, there was no answer to my call, no busy signal, and no voicemail. A reply to Mr. Das's email address was unanswered as of the hearing date. Neither party appeared nor was represented at the scheduled hearing. The application is dismissed.

---

Adelle Guigon  
Deputy Rental Officer