



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 Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on January 23, 2018, the landlord sent each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that each of the tenants is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 28, 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 and the tenants on July 27, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$845.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on August 01, 2015;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$869.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$900.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated January 08, 2018 for \$900.00 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 on the stated effective vacancy date of January 18, 2018;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally handed to Tenant W-S.T.A. at 12:30 p.m. on January 08, 2018; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

It is important to note that landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution appears in twice; however, it does not appear twice on the tenancy agreement or other documents submitted into evidence. Accordingly, I am satisfied that this is an inadvertent error and that a reasonable person would know that landlord referred to in the Application for Dispute Resolution is the same as the landlord referred to in the tenancy agreement and other documents. Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of sections 62 and 64 of the *Act*, I have amended the Landlord's application in order that the landlord's name only appears once.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were duly served with the 10 Day Notice on January 08, 2018, the day it was personally served to Tenant W-S.T.A.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenants are conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the 10 Day Notice, January 18, 2018. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession.

In relation to the Monetary Order, the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request has requested a Monetary Order in the amount of \$900.00 which arises from unpaid

rent for January 2018. In this regard, although documentation was submitted to support the rent increase from \$869.00 to \$900.00, I note there was also a rent increase from \$845.00 to \$869.00 which lacks the necessary documentation, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process.

While I am satisfied that the tenants have not paid rent, the documentation in relation to the rent increase amount is insufficient to enable the issuance of a Monetary Order. As this is an ex parte proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order with leave to reapply.

As the landlord was partially 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 tenants. Should the tenants 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 for unpaid rent 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(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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 *Act*.

Dated: January 29, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch