



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding GOODWOOD PROPERTY INVESTMENTS
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 April 26, 2017, 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 Receipts 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 May 1, 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 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 the landlord and the tenants on September 19, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$875.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on September 1, 2016;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy;
- The Monetary Order Worksheet noted that \$375.00 of the \$1,280.00 identified as owing in the 10 Day Notice was paid on April 4, 2017; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated April 3, 2017, and posted to the tenants' door on April 3, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of April 13, 2017, for \$1,280.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 6:00 pm on April 3, 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 sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on April 6, 2017, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$875.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 tenants are 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, April 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 fees, I would not be able to consider this aspect of the landlord's claim through the direct request process.

I find that the monthly breakdown of rent owing on the Monetary Order Worksheet is incomplete as the landlord has not identified which amounts were applied towards the rent and which amounts were applied to the parking fees. As I am unable to determine the precise amount of rent owing, the monetary portion of the landlord's application is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing as of April 26, 2017.

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.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order 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: May 02, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch