



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding GREATER VICTORIA HOUSING SOCIETY
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 April 19, 2018, the landlord’s agent 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 April 24, 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 October 28, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$350.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 01, 2015;
- 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 \$636.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the period of January 2018 to March 2018;
- A copy of a rental ledger which establishes the payments received and outstanding balance with respect to the tenancy. The ledger demonstrates that the landlord has added parking fees, in the amount of \$25.00, each month to the cumulative balance of unpaid rent owed;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated March 06, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on March 06, 2018, for \$636.00 in unpaid rent due on March 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 16, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent served the Notice to the tenant by way of registered mail on March 06, 2018. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing.

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 relevant documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by registered mail, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice five days after its mailing. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on March 11, 2018, five days after its registered mailing.

As part of the monetary claim established on the application for dispute resolution and on the Direct Request worksheet, the landlord has included additional fees for which reimbursement cannot be sought by way of the Direct Request process. The landlord has added to the monetary claim unpaid charges arising from payment owed for monthly parking and for cable service for the period of January 2018 to March 2018. As reimbursement for additional fees, such as parking fees and payment owed for additional services, such as cable, cannot be sought by way of the Direct Request process, I will address only the portion of the monetary claim which arises from unpaid rent owed for the period of January 2018 to March 2018. I note the landlord remains at liberty to file a separate Application for Dispute Resolution seeking to recover payment owed with respect to parking fees and cable service.

In determining the monthly rent owed with respect to the tenancy, I will rely on the information provided in the tenancy agreement, which demonstrates that the monthly rent agreed upon by the parties was \$350.00. The tenancy agreement provides that other monthly charges, for cablevision, in the amount of \$35.00 are also to be paid each month. However, as stated above, reimbursement for additional fees, such as payment owed for additional services, such as cable, cannot be sought by way of the Direct Request process.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$350.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$447.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the months comprising the period of January 2018 to March 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 corrected effective date of the Notice, March 21, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$447.00 for unpaid rent owed for the months comprising the period of January 2018 to March 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(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 \$547.00 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: May 07, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch