



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR, FFL

Preliminary Matters

The Application for Dispute Resolution originally named five respondents. On September 11, 2018, the landlord submitted an Amendment to an Application for Dispute Resolution form requesting to remove four of the five respondents as they were occupants and not tenants under the agreement.

In accordance with section 64(3)(c) of the *Act* and the landlord's request, I have amended the Application for Dispute Resolution to remove the four occupants, leaving Tenant R.B. as the only respondent.

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 11, 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 September 16, 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 June 8, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,100.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 1, 2015;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$2,100.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$2,177.70;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 30, 2018, for \$4,355.40 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 24, 2018;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was placed in the tenant's mail slot at 9:45 am on August 8, 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 sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on August 11, 2018, three days after it was placed in the mail slot.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$2,177.70, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notice 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, August 24, 2018.

In a Direct Request proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue rent owed for a period beyond the date on which the Notice was issued to the tenant. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot hear the monetary portion of the landlord's application for rent owed for September 2018. For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application for unpaid rent owing from September 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 \$4,355.40, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for July 2018 and August 2018 as of September 3, 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 \$4,455.40 for rent owed for July 2018 and August 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 landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent owing for September 2018 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 17, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch