



# 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 Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on July 25, 2018, the landlord served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided two copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. 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 tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 30, 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 original landlord and the tenants, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,000.00 due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on February 04, 2017;
- 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 \$500.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent due by July 01, 2018. The landlord indicates that the tenants provided a partial payment in the amount of \$535.00;
- A copy of a letter dated October 27, 2017 in which the landlord alerts the tenants to a rent increase to take effect February 01, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated July 03, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on July 03, 2018, for \$500.00 in unpaid rent due on July 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 10, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenants by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on July 03, 2018. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service of the Notice was witnessed and a name and signature for the witness are included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the Act which provides that the tenants 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 tenants did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenants 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 posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenants are deemed to have received the Notice three days after its posting. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants are deemed to have received the Notice on July 06, 2018, three days after its posting.

Section 42 of the Act provides, in part, the following with respect to rent increases:

**Timing and notice of rent increases**

**42** (3) A notice of a rent increase must be in the approved form.

I find that the landlord has provided a copy of a letter dated October 27, 2017 in which the landlord alerts the tenants to a rent increase to take effect February 01, 2018. However, the letter does not constitute an approved rent increase in an approved form which adheres to the requirements as set out in the Act.

The landlord has not provided any evidentiary material, such as copies of Notice of Rent Increase forms served to the tenants, to demonstrate that the monthly rent was increased from the amount stated in the tenancy agreement, to the amount of \$1,035.00 stated on the Direct Request worksheet, in accordance with the Act, nor has the landlord provided any evidence to illustrate that the parties amended the terms of the tenancy agreement to agree upon a new monthly rent amount, or that the parties mutually agreed in writing on a new monthly rent amount. Therefore, in determining the monthly rent amount agreed upon by the parties, I will rely upon the information provided in the tenancy agreement, which establishes that the monthly rent amount to be paid by the tenants is \$1,000.00.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,000.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. The landlord has provided information to demonstrate that the tenants provided a partial payment of \$535.00 on July 01, 2018, resulting in a balance of unpaid rent owed in the amount of \$465.00 for the month of July 2018.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$465.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed by July 01, 2018.

I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenants 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 tenants are conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the Notice, July 16, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$465.00 for unpaid rent owed by July 01, 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(s). 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 \$565.00 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(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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: July 31, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch