



# Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## EX PARTE PROCEEDING

### (DIRECT REQUEST PROCEEDING)

Pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*, the decision in this matter was made without a participatory hearing. The decision was based on an undisputed 10 day Notice to End Tenancy and the written submissions of the Landlord.

A matter regarding DENFORE INVESTMENTS INC.  
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 12, 2017, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice 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 Number to confirm this mailing. 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 17, 2017, 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 and the tenant on October 17, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,660.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on November 1, 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 January 6, 2017, and personally served to the tenant on January 6, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of December 16, 2017, for \$1,685.00 and \$75.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 10:30 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on January 6, 2017. 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 section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on January 6, 2017.

Section 68 of the *Act* allows for the 10 Day Notice to be amended when it is reasonable to do so. I find that the effective date of the 10 Day Notice is December 16, 2017, a date eleven months in the future and that it is reasonable to assume that the landlord's intention was for the effective date to be January 16, 2017. For this reason, I have amended the effective date of the 10 Day Notice to January 16, 2017.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,660.00, 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, January 16, 2017.

I note that the only monetary award available to a landlord by way of the direct request process is for unpaid rent and unpaid utilities. As the landlord has also sought a monetary award for matters relating to parking, I would not be able to consider this aspect of the landlord's claim through the direct request process.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,660.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for January 2017 as of January 12, 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 \$1,660.00 for rent owed for January 2017. 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.

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 17, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch