



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 3, 2017, the landlords sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlords 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 May 8, 2017, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

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

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords 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 a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenant on February 21, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$850.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on March 1, 2016;
- A copy of a Property Transfer Tax Return form showing the transfer of ownership from the former landlord, who is named on the residential tenancy agreement, to the current landlord who is applying for dispute resolution;
- 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 April 17, 2017, and posted to the tenant's door on April 17, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of April 30, 2017, for \$865.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlords indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 10:27 am on April 17, 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 tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on April 20, 2017, three days after its posting.

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 effective date of the 10 Day Notice, April 30, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing as of April 27, 2017.

Part 3, section 41 of the *Act* establishes that "a landlord must not increase rent except in accordance with this Part"

Part 3, section 42 (2) of the *Act* establishes that the landlord “must give a tenant notice of a rent increase at least 3 months before the effective date of the increase”, and section 42 (3) of the *Act* states that “A notice of a rent increase must be in the approved form.”

I find that the residential tenancy agreement submitted by the landlords has a monthly rent listed of \$850.00. The agreement appears to have been amended, crossing out the original amount and inserting a hand-written amount of \$865.00.

I find that this rent adjustment is not in accordance with Part 3 of the *Act*, and raises questions that can only be addressed through a participatory hearing.

For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlords’ application is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords 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.

I dismiss the landlords’ 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 09, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch