

Dispute can end without any winners

Compromise far better option

Daily News Tuesday September 2 2008

THE relationship between tenant and landlord often starts off on a friendly basis when they enter into a contract of lease.

During the lease period, or by the end of it, some relationships would have deteriorated to the point that outside intervention becomes necessary.

Frank entered into short term written lease with Jenny to rent her upmarket dwelling. He paid a deposit of R4000 to her agent and a further R750 for the cost of the lease.

The rental was R4000 a month and the parties further agreed that the lease would be for a fixed period (six months); neither the tenant nor the landlady provided for a renewal or extension to the lease.

In fact, Frank was adamant that he required the dwelling for six months only, from February to July.

The lease ran its six-month period, but Frank moved out on August 3. He was furious when he received R2000 two weeks later, being the refund of his deposit.

A letter from Jenny accompanied the cheque wherein she stated that she had deducted R1650 for the late vacant occupation of her dwelling that prejudiced her financially.

A receipt of R350 for repairs carried out was attached to her letter for alleged damage to the dwelling. Furthermore, she specified that the R2000 was conditional on Frank appending his signature (indicating acceptance) to the copy of the letter and returning it within three days. Frank lodged a complaint with the provincial Rental Housing Tribunal for unfair practice.

Rejected

At mediation, Jenny said she was “generous” in her offer since she did not claim the actual proportionate rental due to her.

Frank rejected the R2000. The matter was thereafter set down for a hearing.

After hearing evidence from both parties, the Tribunal gave its ruling. It was clear from the evidence that Frank had to vacate the dwelling not later than the last day of the sixth month, i.e. July 31.

Jenny lost a tenant who wanted to move into the dwelling on August 1. Another tenant was found during the course of the month that took occupation on August 18. Frank was therefore liable for 17 days rental, three days for occupying the dwelling after the lease expired and had, in fact, terminated and 14 days for the period the dwelling was unoccupied.

Jenny’s claims for damages was rejected because she did not carry out an inspection of the dwelling with Frank before he took occupation, and failed to do so towards the end of the lease period as required by the Rental Housing Act, 50 of 1999.

The Tribunal’s ruling awarded Jenny proportionate rental due to her. Frank was therefore legally responsible for R2267. This meant that the actual refund of his deposit was R1733.

At mediation, parties have to compromise and the “give” and “take” results in an agreement where both parties walk away as “winners”.

A hearing ends in a ruling (equivalent to a magistrate court judgement) that usually has a “winner” and a “loser”.

Dr. Sayed Iqbal Mohamed, Chairperson, Organisation of Civic Rights; Member of the Council of Canadian Administrative Tribunals. www.ocr.org.za For advice, contact Pretty Gumede or Loshni Naidoo on 031 3046451