



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 two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on December 16, 2017, the landlord placed the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding in the mailbox of the rental unit. The landlord had a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service.

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 tenants on September 2, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,300.00, due on the second day of each month for a tenancy commencing on September 2, 2017;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated December 4, 2017 for \$1,300.00 in unpaid rent (the 10 Day Notice). The 10 Day Notice

provides that the tenants had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end;

- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was placed in the tenants' mailbox or mail slot at 10:30 am on December 4, 2017; and
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenants the Notices of Direct Request proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per subsections 89 (1) and (2) of the *Act* which permit service by leaving a copy with the person, sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides, by leaving a copy with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant or by attaching a copy to the door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the tenant resides.

I find that the landlord has served the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding by leaving them in the mailbox of the rental unit, which is not a method of service that is in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*.

In addition, I note that section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

52 *In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must*

(a) be signed and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,

*(b) **give the address of the rental unit,***

*(c) **state the effective date of the notice,...and***

(e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that there is no effective date (the day when the tenants must move out of or vacate the site) on the 10 Day Notice. I also find that there is no address from which the tenants must move of or vacate, on the 10 Day Notice. I find that these omissions invalidate the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not complied with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice of December 4, 2017, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of December 4, 2017, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

As the landlord was not successful in this application, I find that the landlord is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of December 4, 2017, is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of December 4, 2017, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

This tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the *Act*.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application without 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: December 18, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch