



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding H.W. ROOMS
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes CNC, CNR, FFL, OPR -DR

Introduction

This hearing was convened in response to cross-applications by the parties pursuant to the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the “Act”) for Orders as follows:

The landlords requested:

- an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to section 55;
- a monetary order for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67; and
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application, pursuant to section 72 .

The tenant requested:

- cancellation of the landlords’ 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) pursuant to section 46;
- cancellation of the landlords’ 1 Month Notice to End Tenancy for Cause (“ 1 Month Notice”), pursuant to section 47;

While the landlords attended the hearing by way of conference call, the tenant did not. I waited until 11:10 a.m. to enable the tenant to participate in this scheduled hearing for 11:00 a.m. The landlords were given a full opportunity to be heard, to present affirmed testimony, to make submissions and to call witnesses.

Rule 7.3 of the Rules of Procedure provides as follows:

7.3 Consequences of not attending the hearing

If a party or their agent fails to attend the hearing, the arbitrator may conduct the dispute resolution hearing in the absence of that party, or dismiss the application, with or without leave to re-apply.

The landlord gave sworn testimony that on February 15, 2018 copies of the Application for Dispute Resolution hearing package ('Application') and evidence were personally served to the tenant in the presence of a witness. In accordance with sections 88 and 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with copies of the landlords' application and evidence.

The landlords provided undisputed testimony that the tenant was served with the 10 Day Notice, with an effective date of February 15, 2018 by personally serving the tenant in the presence of a witness. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on February 5, 2018.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice?
Are the landlords entitled to a monetary award for unpaid rent or money owed under the tenancy agreement, regulation, or *Act*?
Are the landlords entitled to recover the filing fee for this application?

Background and Evidence

The landlord gave undisputed testimony regarding the following facts. The tenancy began on October 1, 2017, with monthly rent set at \$525.00, payable on the first of each month. The landlord collected, and still holds, a security deposit of \$187.50. The tenant continues to reside in the rental unit.

The landlord issued the 10 Day Notice on February 5, 2018 to the tenant, indicating an effective move-out date of February 15, 2018. The landlords testified that the tenant have not paid the rent in fully since January. The landlord testified that the tenant has been short \$150.00 for each of the months of January 2018-April 2018 for a total owing of \$600.00.

Analysis

Section 55(1) of the *Act* reads as follows:

55 (1) If a tenant makes an application for dispute resolution to dispute a landlord's notice to end a tenancy, the director must grant to the landlord an order of possession of the rental unit if

- (a) the landlord's notice to end tenancy complies with section 52 [*form and content of notice to end tenancy*], and
- (b) the director, during the dispute resolution proceeding, dismisses the tenant's application or upholds the landlord's notice.

In the absence of any evidence or submissions from the tenant, I order the tenant's application dismissed without liberty to reapply. I find that the 10 Day Notice complies with section 52 of the *Act*.

Based on my decision to dismiss the tenant's application for dispute resolution and pursuant to section 55(1) of the *Act*, I find that the landlords are entitled to a 2 day Order of Possession. The landlords will be given a formal Order of Possession which must be served on the tenant. If the tenant does not vacate the rental unit within the 2 days required, the landlords may enforce this Order in the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

The landlords provided undisputed evidence that the tenant failed to pay the rent in full for the months of January 2018-April 2018. Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to \$600.00 in arrears for the above period.

The landlords continue to hold the tenant's security deposit in the amount of \$187.50. Although the landlord has not applied to retain the deposit, in accordance with the offsetting provisions of section 72 of the *Act*, I order the landlords to retain the tenant's security deposit in partial satisfaction of the monetary claim.

I find that the landlords are entitled to recovery the \$100.00 filing fee from the tenant.

Conclusion

As the tenant did not attend this hearing, their entire application is dismissed without leave to reapply.

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords effective **two (2) days after service on the tenants**. Should the tenant or anyone on the premises fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

I issue a \$512.50 Monetary Order in favour of the landlords under the following terms, which allows the landlords to recover unpaid rent and the filing fee, and also allows the landlords to retain the tenant's security deposit:

Item	Amount
Unpaid Rent for January 2018	\$150.00
Unpaid Rent for February 2018	150.00
Unpaid Rent for March 2018	150.00
Unpaid Rent for April 2018	150.00
Recovery of Filing Fee	100.00
Less Security Deposit	-187.50
Total Monetary Order	\$512.50

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 *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: April 18, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch