



Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 16, 2016, the landlord’s agent “SW” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received 5 days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 21, 2016, 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 Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord's agent and the tenant on June 2, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,050.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2014;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the unpaid rent and utilities owing, as well as partial payments received, during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$2,021.49, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent and utilities owing as of January 15, 2016;
- Copies of emails addressed from the landlord to the tenant in which the landlord informs the tenant of the amount of unpaid utilities owed and requests payment of the sum of unpaid utilities owed;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent and Utilities (the Notice) dated January 4, 2016, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on January 4, 2016, for \$1,715.00 in unpaid rent due on January 1, 2016, and \$306.49 in unpaid utilities due on November 16, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of January 17, 2016; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "SW" served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit at 6:00 PM on January 4, 2016. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "QL" and a signature for "QL" is included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the *Act* which provides that the tenant had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice three days after its posting. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on January 7, 2016, three days after its posting.

Direct Request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability for the tenants to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the Notice, and all related documents with respect to the Direct Request process, in accordance with the *Act* and Policy Guidelines. 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 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.

Subsection 46(6) of the *Act*, reads in part as follows:

If

(a) a tenancy agreement requires the tenant to pay utility charges to the landlord, and

(b) the utility charges are unpaid more than 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for payment of them,

the landlord may treat the unpaid utility charges as unpaid rent and may give notice under this section.

The tenancy agreement included as part of this application includes a term which establishes that the tenant is responsible for 50% of the cost for hydro, as well as 50% of the cost for the gas utility. The landlord provided copies of emails addressed from the landlord to the tenant in which the landlord informs the tenant of the amount of unpaid utilities owed and requests payment of the balance of unpaid utilities owed. If a tenant is provided a written demand to provide payment of a utility charge for which he is responsible, the landlord may treat the unpaid utility charges as unpaid rent only if the utility charges remain unpaid more than 30 days after the written demand.

“Policy Guideline #39. Direct Requests” provides the guidelines which govern the Direct Request process. The guideline provides that the onus is on the landlord to ensure that they have included all required documents necessary for an application for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process. Policy Guideline #39 establishes that the landlord must provide, when making an application for dispute resolution for a monetary Order for unpaid rent arising from unpaid utilities, copies of the demand letter which includes copies of the utility bills. I find that the application before me does not include copies of the utility bills which form the basis of the landlord’s calculation for the sum of the unpaid utilities owed by the tenant.

Therefore, as the landlord has not followed the requirements under “Policy Guideline #39. Direct Requests” by providing copies of the utility bills which are referenced throughout the application, it is not open for the landlord to seek reimbursement of the unpaid utilities by way of a monetary Order via the Direct Request process. I dismiss that portion of the landlord’s application for a monetary Order that deals with unpaid

utilities with leave to reapply. I limit my consideration of the landlord's request for a monetary Order to the unpaid rent claimed as owing to the landlord.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,050.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay outstanding rental arrears in the amount of \$1,715.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the period of November 2015 to January 2016. I find that the tenant received the Notice on January 7, 2016. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenant did not pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not apply to dispute the Notice within that 5-day period.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenant is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice, January 17, 2016.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,715.00 for unpaid rent owing for the period of November 2015 to January 2016, as of January 15, 2016.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. Should the tenant(s) 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 \$1,715.00 for unpaid rent owing for the period of November 2015 to January 2016, as of January 15, 2016. The landlord is provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant fail to comply with these Orders, these Orders may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as Orders 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: January 22, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch