



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding CASCADIA APARTMENT RENTALS LTD
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the “*Act*”), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlord submitted two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on July 14, 2015, the landlord sent the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 19, 2015, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenants on November 21, 2013, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,295.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2013;
- A copy of a letter showing a change in name of the management company from the landlord who is named on the residential tenancy agreement to the current landlord who is applying for dispute resolution;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$1,295.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$1,325.00 as of July 1, 2015;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing for July 2015, an outstanding balance of \$2,625.00 from June 2015 and rent paid during this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 3, 2015, and posted to the tenants' door on July 3, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 13, 2015, for \$1,850.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 4:10 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on July 3, 2015. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenants had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on July 16, 2015, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,295 until June 30 2015 and in the amount of \$1,325 as of July 1, 2015, as per the tenancy agreement and Notice of Rent Increase.

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and that such evidentiary material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

The landlord did not submit a ledger or supporting documentation to show how the rental arrears arrived at the amount of \$2,625.00 as of June 1, 2015. I find that without this additional clarification, I am unable to award monetary compensation for rent prior to July 1, 2015.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary order for rent prior to July 1, 2015, with leave to reapply.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay the rent owed for July 2015 in full within the 5 days granted under section 46(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that 5 day period

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenants are conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected date of the 10 Day Notice, July 16, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,325.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for July 2015 as of July 14, 2015.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenants. Should the tenants fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,325.00 for rent owed for July 2015. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenants must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenants fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

This decision is made on authority delegated to me by the Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch under Section 9.1(1) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: July 20, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

