



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPUM-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 November 8, 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 will be deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on November 13, 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 the tenant on July 5, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$900.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 15, 2016;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy;
- Two copies of utility bills from Fortis BC for the rental unit dated August 29, 2017 for \$36.81 and September 28, 2017 for \$37.81 totaling \$74.62;
- A copy of a utility bills from BC Hydro for the rental unit dated September 27, 2017 for \$144.65; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated October 4, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of October 14, 2017, for \$900.00 in unpaid rent and \$109.62 in unpaid utilities.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 12:30 pm on October 4, 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

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and that such evidentiary material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

Section 46 (6) of the *Act* allows the landlord to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent, 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for them. I find that there is no written demand in the landlord's evidence submissions which would allow the landlord to treat the utilities as unpaid rent.

For this reason the landlord's application for an Order of Possession for unpaid utilities and a Monetary Order is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application 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: November 08, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch