



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 August 2, 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 submission 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 August 2, 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 a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord on October 19, 2015 and the tenant on November 19, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,295.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 1, 2015;

- A printout of a series of 5 text messages between the landlord and tenant which discuss renewing the agreement for an increased rent of \$1,395.00;
- 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 July 12, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 17, 2017, for \$1,395.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 11:20 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on July 12, 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 July 15, 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 corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, July 25, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for July 2017 as of July 25, 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."

When there has been a rent increase, the landlord must provide the appropriate Notice of Rent Increase forms or a new signed residential tenancy agreement to substantiate claim for the increased rent. I find that the landlord has raised the rent by way of text messages and that this rent increase is not in accordance with Part 3 of the *Act*.

For this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order is dismissed with leave to reapply.

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: August 08, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch