Annexure "A"

<u>Page 1 of 4</u>

The Defendants move to dismiss the action for want of jurisdiction.

The claim was issued in June 2016, some eleven months after the rental property at 49 Springfield Way was vacated by the defendant tenants.

The one year lease commenced September 1, 2014. It was not a happy experience for either landlord or tenant. The former brought an action in this court for \$17,166.55, all but \$2,700 of it relating to damage and deficiencies allegedly caused by tenants. The \$2,700 is for arrears rent inclusive of \$50 NSF charge for bounced cheque.

The defence sets out a litany of complaints about the landlord's shortcomings in maintaining the property. There are numerous issues involving allegations and counter allegations which will occupy some time at trial. In May 2015 the defendants gave the requisite 60 day notice to the plaintiff, and vacated the premises in July 2015.

The landlord of course had a statutory right of inspection prior to it's vacating by tenants. In an affidavit from the defendant Pamela Klerer sworn August 1, 2017, she states in support of this motion:

> "In the two months prior to the termination of the tenancy, the plaintiff attended at the premises and I showed him the various issues with the premises that required maintenance. All items of damage alleged by the plaintiff were present at the time the plaintiff attended at the premises."

The plaintiff responded in his affidavit of August 29, 2017 that, to the contrary, he responded to and

Page 2 of 4

addressed all deficiency complaints by the defendants.

He contends that he only became aware of the full extent of the damage after the defendants had left and only issued claim once the full extent of the damage was known to him.

He did not conduct a full assessment of the damages whilst the tenants were on site as several different contractors were required and there was a "multitude of damages."

He concedes that he received 60 days notice but was left in the dark as to why the defendants were leaving.

sec. 89 (1) of the Residential Tenancies Act permits a landlord to approach the Residential Tenancy Board for relief from damage where the tenant is still on site. The reference to repairs "incurred" or <u>will</u> incur (ie future tense) seems to me to make it clear that the issue is not the landlord must approach the Board whilst the tenant is <u>still onsite</u> and not the issues are determinable by the <u>Board</u> otherwise the future tense utilisation makes no sense.

There is a wealth of authority provided by the defendant to the effect that the Residential

Tenancy Board is the forum to go to in a landlord/ tenant dispute. They have the expertise and the protocol to deal with these matters.

I have reviewed the plaintiff's arguments as well,

I recognize that the defendants arguments can lead to anomalies. It means that the tenant controls the agenda. The tenant can slip out in the dark of night leaving the landlord high and dry and without recourse. He can not approach the Board if the tenant is no longer on site nor can he seek relief in the Small Claims Court because the latter simply lacks jurisdiction.

In an effort to address this anomaly the jurisprudence has moved towards a compromise

Page 3 of 4

which allows the landlord the jurisdiction at the Small Claims Court if he/she could not have ascertained the damage by the exercise of due diligence. The points in the existing case law are that if the damage occured post-tenancy or even during the tenancy but could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence, then the Small Claims Court remains open to the landlord.

Indeed, in Brydges v Johnson [2016] OJ #609 Kelertas KJ refused to dismiss the plaintiff's claim and ordered it to proceed to trial on the basis that the issue of due diligence prior to vacating was not determinable without a full articulating of the issues at trial.

Now, Brydges was a case where the Deputy Judge on his own notion canvassed the issue of jurisdiction and decided it after the parties called <u>no</u> evidence and relied <u>solely</u> on the <u>pleadings</u> and their <u>oral</u> <u>submissions.</u>

In this case I heard a motion in the <u>full</u> tense of the concept, with sworn evidence on both sides. There is some assumption that both sides will put their proverbial "best foot forward" Both sides utilised this in a professional manner, vehemently argued & reached It is not contested that there was 60 days notice to the plaintiff had ample time to inspect the property and look for damages. There is no assertion that the plaintiff did so and found nothing. He states that is was "unreasonable and unnecessary" to conduct a full assessment.

But this all begs the question: what stopped him from an inspection in the 60 days after the notice that the tenants were still occupying the property? Clearly, there is nothing advanced which would meet due diligence standards expected of a landlord of property. and the damage was capable of existing during that 60 day period.

The argument that he would or could only issue claim once he knew the full extent of the damages

Page 4 of 4

is understandable on same level but it still does not address the technical issue of jurisdiction and The sec. 89 mechanism which speaks to futuristic repairs determinable at the Board. As an aside, were his matters to proceed to trial it would not on the simple issue of due diligence.

The defence takes issue with practically everything and jurisdictional due diligence would simply add to the complications of manifold allegations both ways as to who bears the responsibility for the damage.

In all the circumstances of this particular case it seems to me that the weight of the law and all the practical considerations mitigate against this proceeding to trial.

In the result the claim is dismissed against all defendants.

Superior Court of Justice Cour supérieure de justice

Endorsement Record/Order of the Court Fiche d'inscription/Ordonnance judiciaire

UNING COURT OF	Richmond Hill	SC-16-00110000-0000
RIOCIC CLAIMS COLONI	Small Claims Court / Cour des petites créances de	Court File No./ Nº de la demande
Contraction of the second	Le Parc Office Tower 8500 Leslie Street Su	_
* RICHMOND HILL	Address / Adresse	-
	Markham, ON L3T 7M8	_
COCK A CAS PETITES CREATE SS	(905)731-2664	_
ERIEURE OF	Phone number / N° de téléphone	_
BETWEEN / ENTRE:		
	URI KISELMAN	
		Plaintiff
		Demandeur
	and / et	
JOEL KLERER, AKA (OWNER OF I.O.F. BUSINESS FURNITURE MANUFACTURING INC); PAMELA KLERER; I.O.F. INTELLIGENT OFFICE FURNITURE		
		Defendant
		Défendeur
Representative of the plaintif		Voolegel
Représentant du demandeur		
Representative of the defend		court
Représentant du défendeur .	U ·	
Event type: Motion on notice Type d'affaire:		
On 05-SEP-2017 , a h	nearing was held in the above matter and the following or	der was made:
Le une audience a eu lieu concernant l'affaire susmentionnée, et l'ordonnance suivante a été re		
-	31	1.
For ful	reasons, see annexure	A
In the result the claim is		
dismissed against all he defendets		
No order to costo.		

Signature of judge / Signature du juge

S. Ball 07

Superior Court of Justice Cour supérieure de justice

Page 2

Endorsement Record/Order of the Court Fiche d'inscription/Ordonnance judiciaire

SC-16-00110000-0000 Court File No./ N* de la demande

DARIA KRYSIK STEINBERG TITLE HOPE & ISREAL LLP 5255 YONGE STREET SUITE 1100 TORONTO ON CA M2N 6P4

Fax: (416)225-7112

I.O.F. INTELLIGENT OFFICE FURNITURE C/O JOEL KLERER 159 GRANDVIEW AVE THORNHILL ON CA L3T 1H9

JOEL KLERER 159 GRANDVIEW AVE THORNHILL ON CA L3T 1H9

LUIGI INNAMORATO CARR LAW PROFESSIONAL CORP. 3550 RUTHERFORD ROAD UNIT 84 VAUGHAN ON CA L4H 3T8

Fax: ()-

Annexure "A The defendants more to disnuiss the action for eleven months after the rental property at 49 wand of junsdiction. Springfield way was vacated by the dependent The one year leave commenced Septenter 1, 2014. tenants. It was not a happy experience for either landland or terrount. The former brought an actien in his cout for \$1716655, all but \$2,000 of it relating to domoge and deficiencies allegedly caused by teronts. The \$2000 is for arrear part plus inclusive of \$50 NSF change Av bounced cheque. NSF change Av bounced cheque. The defence sets out a literry of complaints about de landlard's shotcoming in maintaining he propaty. Thee are numerous issues involving all egaties and Thee are numerous issues involving some thre at involving some the at involves some the at involves one the at involves on In May 2015 the defendants gave to requisite 60 day rotice to be plaintely, and vacanted he premiss in July 2015 menning in July 2015. The bundlard of course had a stantity right of The bundlard of course had a stantity for an inspection prior to its vacating by terrarts. August, inspection prior to its vacating the reverse moments affidiated from the defendant pamela motion 2017, she states in support of mis motion "In the two mates prior to he territation of he tenarcy, he plaintiff attended at he interview and 7 downed him he varia te premises and Z showed him he varias issues with he mensiles hart required maintenance. All items of damage alleged by re rearrights were present out the sine he plaintigo askeded at he The pleincluff responded in his altidated of August 29, 2017 mat, do he centrony, he responded do and

addressed all deficiency complexits by he dependents. (2) He cantedo that he only Deceme aware & he true satert of he damage after he dependents had left and only issned claim are he full extent of damage was known to him.

He did not and we a full assessment of he damages whilst he tenants were an site as "several differnt involutions were required" and bee was a "multihade at damage."

He cancedes hat he received 60 dogs notice but nos left in he dark as to why the femants were learny.

ser. 29(i) of he Resideatial Tenancies Bet perits a landlord to approach he Kesichestrail Tenany Board for relief from damage where he tenant is still on site. The requese to repairs "incurred" or still on site. The requese to repairs "incurred" or vill war (l'etutive terse) reans do me to make it clear mat me estos is hat te landlord ment. approch re board whilst the ferrant is still on site and not re issues are determinable by re-Board-oherie te statue tense utilisation malos no sente. The is a welter of a herity provided hype dependent to be effect that he Kostilitied a landlood | Terrory Board is he borun & go & in a landlood | terrory dispute. They have be superive and re ferror dispute. They have be matters. I have remeived he reachtfis arheits I have renewed he peantiffs and intres I recognise hat the defendets around the can load do anomalio. Zt means that he tenant campolo he agenda. The tenant campip out in he date of night leaving he landlard

out in he dule do night leans de land high and dry and inhat recourse. He cannet approch he Board for he terrest is no large on site nor can he seek veling in he Small Clairs is and became he latter simply lacks junisdictor. Cast became he latter simply his anomaly is an effort to adolers his anomaly he junispudere ho neved burnds a carpronite

which allows he landlord he juisdicter at he O Small claims court of helike could not have orcetained he damage by he exercice of due The printers in he acisting care low are hat it diligence. he damage occurred past-tenang or even ding te terrary ent cald not have been ascetaired ly he aconse of reasonable diligence, han he Snall Clain Can't remain open to be landlard. Troleed, in Bryders v Johnon Eroi6] 057#+609 Keletes no refused & dismiss be peaintiffs dain and ordered it to proceed to him on he bars hat he issue & due differre priv de vacating ever not determable mont à Rue ventilation of he issues not Now Brigdors was a one where he happing Judge on his own notion convaried be issue of juisdiction mal. and decided it after he parties called so endre advelied idely on the pleading and her and In his care I heard a motion in the full sere of the concept, with sum andere on submissing. both sides. There is some anytin that both sides. There is some anytin that for any and ind sides will be this in a protection here was 60 days not cerearched It is not antisted that here was 60 days not cere te plaintiff had angle dire & ispert he more try and look for damages. There is no assertion hat the plaintiff did so and ford nothing. The state the plaintiff did so and ford nothing. I've state mut it was innersable and innecesses " to But his all bego he quistic what styped him conduct a Qu'll arsensment. from an inspection in he 60 days after notice hat he tenants were shill accorpting he proputy? clearly, noe is nothing advanced which wald meet due diligence standards accorded diligence standards expected of a bundlard ob monenty. and he domage was carpable of existing during that 60 day priddine orgunit hat he would are cared any iske claim nie re brev ne pull actent of he damages

is understandable on some level but it still does (A) not address de technical isru bjinsdricta od de cer. Pa mechanism which speaks to futuristic repairs. determinable at he Board, whe this matter to proceed to trail as an asside, we this matter to proceed to trail it naled not be on he simple issue of due diligere. The defence takes issue with prosetially everything and inisdictional due diligerer unld simply add to be conflications of manifold allegations both ways as to unto been de reponsibility for me danage. The dele he arenteres to his particular are it seens do me that he weight of he law and all one prosetical considerations militate against this proceeding to man In he venet he claim is dismissed against all dependeds.