



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding HOLLYBURN ESTATES LTD  
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 which declares that on July 20, 2018, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 25, 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 tenant on November 6, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,310.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 20, 2014;
- Three copies of Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,310.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$1,444.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 3, 2018, for \$1,648.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenant 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 July 16, 2018;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 4:30 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on July 3, 2018; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet and ledger showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on July 6, 2018, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,444.00, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notices of Rent Increase.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 46(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day 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 10 Day Notice, July 16, 2018.

I note that the only monetary award available to a landlord by way of the direct request process is for unpaid rent and unpaid utilities. As the landlord has also sought monetary awards for matters relating to lockers, parking, and late fees in the amount of \$175.00, I would not be able to consider this aspect of the landlord's claim through the direct request process.

I also note that the ledger submitted by the landlord lists the balance owing at the end of June 2018 as \$179.00 yet the 10 Day Notice and the Direct Request Worksheet indicate that the outstanding rent for June 2018 was \$204.00. Due to this discrepancy, I find that I am not able to determine the precise amount of rent owing for June 2018. For this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent owing for June 2018 is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$1,444.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for July 2018 as of July 12, 2018.

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 tenant. Should the tenant 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 grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,544.00 for rent owed for July 2018 and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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.

I dismiss the balance of the landlord's application for a Monetary Order with leave to reapply.

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 26, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch