



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR FFL

Preliminary Matters

The landlord named two people as respondents in their Application for Dispute Resolution however I find that the residential tenancy agreement submitted by the landlord is only signed by Tenant D.H. I find that I am only able to proceed against the tenant who signed the residential tenancy agreement.

Section 64(3)(c) allows me to amend a landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution to remove the respondent K.M. who has not signed the tenancy agreement, which I have done.

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 January 05, 2018, 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 submission of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 10, 2018, 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 on September 03, 2017 and the tenant on August 31, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,800.00, due on the 31st day of each month for a tenancy commencing on September 15, 2017;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated December 16, 2017 for \$1,950.00 in unpaid rent (the 10 Day Notice). The 10 Day Notice provides 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 on the stated effective vacancy date of December 26, 2017;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 3:15 p.m. on December 16, 2017; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

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 December 19, 2017, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,800.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

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, December 29, 2017. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession.

In a Direct Request proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue rent owed for a period beyond the date on which the Notice was issued to the tenant. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot hear the monetary portion of the landlord's application for rent owed for January 2018. For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application for unpaid rent owing from January 2018 is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,950.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for November and December 2017 as of January 04, 2018.

As the landlord was successful in this application, I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

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.

Pursuant to sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$2,050.00 for rent owed for November and December 2017 and 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.

I dismiss the monetary portion of the landlord's application for unpaid rent owing from January 2018, 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 *Act*.

Dated: January 11, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch