



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 landlords (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 August 10, 2018, the landlord “AS” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by signing the Proof of Service form. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “SS” and a signature for “SS” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on August 10, 2018.

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, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,100.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 01, 2018;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$2,200.00 for outstanding rent due by July 01, 2018, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the months of June 2018 and July 2018. The landlord has indicated that a separate fee, in the amount of \$270.00, is owed for moving expenses;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated July 14, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on July 14, 2018, for \$2,200.00 in unpaid rent due on July 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 23, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice form asserting that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of personal service via hand-delivery at on July 14, 2018. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant acknowledged receipt of the Notice by signing the Proof of Service 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 and find that in accordance with section 88 of the *Act* the tenant was duly served with the Notice on July 14, 2018.

As part of the monetary claim established on the application for dispute resolution and on the Direct Request worksheet, and the Notice issued to the tenant, the landlord has included a fee 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 moving expenses in the amount of \$270.00. As reimbursement for additional fees, such as moving expenses, 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 months of June 2018 and July 2018. I note the landlord remains at liberty to file a separate Application for Dispute Resolution seeking to recover additional charges claimed as owed by the tenant, such as moving expenses.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,100.00, 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 \$2,200.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed by July 01, 2018, for the months of June 2018 and July 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, July 24, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$2,200.00 for unpaid rent owed by July 01, 2018, as claimed on the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request.

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 \$2,300.00 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: August 13, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch