



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding CENTURY 21 IN TOWN REALTY C/O PENMAN PROPERTIES-RENTAL
MANAGEMENT GROUP 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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 8, 2017, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenant sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 8, 2017.

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 and the tenant on November 25, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,750.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on November 25, 2016;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 12, 2016, and posted to the tenant's door on December 12, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of December 22, 2016, for \$2,100.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 11:55 am on December 12, 2016. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenant 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 tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on December 15, 2016, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,750.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed 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 tenant is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, December 25, 2016.

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.

In a Direct Request proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue rent owed for a period beyond the date on which the Notice was issued to the tenant. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot hear the monetary portion of the landlord's application for rent owed for January 2017.

I also note that the 10 Day Notice submitted by the landlord includes amounts related to rent owed for November 2016. I find that the tenancy agreement does not require a pro-rated amount of rent to be paid for the month of November 2016. In order to substantiate the landlord's claim for any monies over and above the amount of rent as shown on the tenancy agreement, the evidence must clearly show any additional months for which the tenant still owes rent.

For these reasons, the monetary portions of the landlord's application for unpaid rent owing from November 2016 and January 2017 are dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,750.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for December 2016 as of January 5, 2017.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. Should the tenant 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 \$1,750.00 for rent owed for December 2016. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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.

I dismiss the monetary portions of landlord's application for unpaid rent owing from November 2016 and January 2017 with leave to reapply.

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 10, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch