



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding BELMONT PROPERTIES  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **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 form which declares that on February 23, 2018, the landlord’s agent “TP” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service.

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 February 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 the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord's agent and the tenant on June 02, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$860.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on July 01, 2016;
- The landlord established the manner in which the monthly rent was raised from the initial \$860.00 stated in the tenancy agreement to the current amount of \$891.00 by providing a copy of a "Notice of Rent Increase" form provided to the tenant during the course of the tenancy;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$711.00 for outstanding rent due by February 01, 2018, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for February 2018. The landlord indicates that a partial payment of \$200.00 was received on February 06, 2018;
- A copy of a rental ledger which establishes the payments received and outstanding balance with respect to the tenancy. The ledger depicts that an additional fee of \$20.00 is charged each month for parking;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated February 06, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on February 06, 2018, for \$911.00 in unpaid rent due on February 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of February 16, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "TP" served the Notice to the tenant by way of personal service via hand-delivery at 2:00 PM on February 06, 2018. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "DV" and a signature for "DV" is included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the *Act* which provides that the tenant had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord and find that in accordance with section 88 of the *Act* the tenant was duly served with the Notice on February 06, 2018.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$891.00, as the landlord has established that the monthly rent amount was raised from the initial amount of \$860.00, as established in the tenancy agreement, to the current amount of \$891.00.

As part of the monetary claim established on the Direct Request worksheet, the landlord has included a fee for which reimbursement cannot be sought by way of the Direct Request process. The monthly rent owed is \$891.00, however, the information provided on the Direct Request worksheet and the rental ledger provided by the landlord demonstrates that the monthly rent owed for February 2018 is \$911.00. According to the rental ledger, in calculating the monthly rent owed for February 2018, the landlord has also added to this amount a monthly parking fee of \$20.00.

As reimbursement for additional fees, such as parking fees, cannot be sought by way of the Direct Request process, I will consider only the portion of the monetary claim which arises from unpaid rent owed for the month of February 2018. I note the landlord remains at liberty to file a separate Application for Dispute Resolution seeking to recover additional fees agreed upon by the parties in the tenancy agreement.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$891.00. According to the documentary evidence provided by the landlord, a partial payment of \$200.00 was provided by the tenant on February 06, 2018, resulting in a balance of unpaid rent in the amount of \$691.00 owed for February 2018.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$691.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed by February 01, 2018 for the month of February 2018.

I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenant did not pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not apply to dispute the 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 effective date of the Notice, February 16, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$691.00 for unpaid rent owing for February 2018, as of February 20, 2018, the date on which the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request was submitted.

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(s) 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 find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$791.00 for unpaid rent, and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlord is provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant fail to comply with these Orders, these Orders may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as Orders 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: March 01, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch