

IN THE MATTER between **FORT SIMPSON HOUSING AUTHORITY**, Applicant,
and **EMMA AMUNDSON**, 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:

FORT SIMPSON HOUSING AUTHORITY

Applicant/Landlord

- and -

EMMA AMUNDSON

Respondent/Tenant

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The application is dismissed.

DATED at the City of Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories this 9th day of June,
2015.

Hal Logsdon
Rental Officer

IN THE MATTER between **FORT SIMPSON HOUSING AUTHORITY**, Applicant,
and **EMMA AMUNDSON**, 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:

FORT SIMPSON HOUSING AUTHORITY

Applicant/Landlord

-and-

EMMA AMUNDSON

Respondent/Tenant

REASONS FOR DECISION

Date of the Hearing: **June 3, 2015**

Place of the Hearing: **Fort Simpson, NT via teleconference**

Appearances at Hearing: **Kathy Konisenta, representing the applicant**
 Emma Amundson, respondent

Date of Decision: **June 3, 2015**

REASONS FOR DECISION

The applicant alleged that the respondent had breached the tenancy agreement by failing to pay the rent on the days it was due and sought an order requiring the respondent to pay future rent on time. The applicant provided a statement of the rent account which indicated a balance of rent owing in the amount of \$12,896.63. The premises are subsidized public housing.

A previous order (file #10-12548, filed on January 25, 2012) required the respondent to pay rent arrears of \$12,237 in monthly installments of \$50 until the rent arrears were paid in full and to pay future rent on time. Although the applicant was asked to provide an updated rent statement showing transactions in chronological order, an aged analysis was presented in evidence which did not include any transactions prior to May 01, 2013. The evidence provided by the landlord makes it impossible to determine if previous assessed rents were adjusted or determine the total amount of rent payments made since the issuance of the previous order. The applicant testified that the respondent had been making regular arrears payments and had not breached the previous order. The applicant stated that the application had been made because it was felt that the ordered monthly payments should be increased.

I find no justification to rescind the previous order. The parties consented to the previous order and, according to the applicant, that order has not been breached. The application seeks only an order to pay future rent on time. The previous order to pay future rent on time is still in effect.

The application is dismissed.

Hal Logsdon
Rental Officer