



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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 2, 2018, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenant and a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission 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 September 2, 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 on December 30, 2017 and the tenant on December 21, 2017, indicating a monthly

rent of \$875.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on January 1, 2018;

- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$875.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$910.00 as of July 1, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated August 4, 2018, for \$910.00 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 August 14, 2018;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was signed by the tenant and indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 8:30 pm on August 4, 2018; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on August 4, 2018.

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, August 14, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for August 2018 as of August 27, 2018.

Part 3, section 42 and 41(1) (a) of the *Act* establishes that a landlord must not impose a rent increase for at least 12 months after the date on which the tenant's rent was first payable for the rental unit.

I find that the tenancy agreement indicates that this tenancy commenced on January 1, 2018, and that the earliest that a rent increase under the *Act* could take effect would be January 1, 2018. I find that the landlord's Notice of Rent Increase was effective as of July 1, 2018, which is earlier than the 12 months required under the *Act*.

I note that the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution refers to a prior tenancy agreement that began on July 1, 2017; however, I find that the landlord has not provided a copy of this tenancy agreement.

I find that I am not able to confirm whether the landlord has increased the rent in accordance with the *Act*, and for this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

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 section 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 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 landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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: September 07, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch