



# 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 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 June 20, 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 June 25, 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 November 26, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$840.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2014;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$855.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$875.00;
- 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 June 2, 2017, and posted to the tenant's door on June 2, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of June 15, 2017, for \$875.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 11:04 am on June 2, 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 June 5, 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, June 15, 2017.

I note that the amount of rent on the tenancy agreement does not match the amount of rent being claimed on the 10 Day Notice. If there has been a rent increase, all appropriate Notice of Rent Increase forms must be submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution to substantiate the claim for the increased rent. I find that the landlord has not submitted all the Notices of Rent Increase to show each stage of the rent being changed from the amount indicated on the tenancy agreement to the amount being claimed on the 10 Day Notice.

I also note that the name of a landlord indicated on the Notice of Rent Increase form submitted by the landlord is not the name of the landlord as it appears on the residential tenancy agreement, the application for dispute resolution, or any other documents submitted along with this application.

I find that these discrepancies raise questions that cannot be answered within the purview of the direct request process. For this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order is dismissed with leave to reapply

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for June 2017 as of June 20, 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.

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: June 27, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch