

Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR FFL

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 October 26, 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 October 31, 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?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 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, and by the tenant on April 27, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$755.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on May 01, 2015;
- Two copies of Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$755.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$805.00;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing 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 October 02, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of October 12, 2017, for \$797.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was left in the mail box or mail slot at the tenant's residence at 6:00 p.m. on October 02, 2017. The 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 October 05, 2017, three days after it was placed in the mail box or mail slot.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 46(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that five 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, October 15, 2017, pursuant to Section 53 of the *Act*. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession.

In relation to the Monetary Order, I find that in the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, the landlord establishes a request for a Monetary Order in the amount of \$797.00 which arises from unpaid rent for October 2017.

The monthly rent in the tenancy agreement was established at \$755.00. The landlord has established a new monthly rent amount by way of two Notice of Rent Increase forms. However, it appears that the Notice of Rent Increase form dated January 25, 2016 may have increased the rent beyond the amount permitted under the *Act*. The 10 Day Notice that forms the basis of the landlord's Application relies on the current monthly rent amount that has been established as a result of a potentially incorrect amount on the Notice of Rent Increase form dated January 25, 2016 provided to the tenant. Therefore, while I am satisfied that the tenant has not paid rent, the documentation in relation to the rent increase amount is insufficient to enable the issuing of a Monetary Order.

Direct request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability of a tenant to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on a landlord in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied.

Lastly, I find that as the landlord was partially successful in this application that they are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

Page: 3

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 claim for a Monetary Order but provide the landlord leave to re-apply for the outstanding rent through the conventional participatory hearing process.

Pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. 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: November 01, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch