



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding DRANLY HOLDINGS 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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlords submitted two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on September 11, 2018, the landlords sent each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants are 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

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on August 31, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,800.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on October 1, 2016;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$1,800.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,840.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated September 2, 2018, for \$1,875.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 September 12, 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 tenants' door at 11:25 am on September 2, 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 tenants were deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on September 5, 2018, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 tenants are conclusively presumed under sections 46(5) and 53(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, September 15, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for September 2018 as of September 11, 2018.

I note that the amounts of rent indicated on the tenancy agreement (\$1,800.00) and the Notice of Rent Increase (\$1,840.00) do not match the amount of rent being claimed on the 10 Day Notice (\$1,875.00). In order to claim for additional rent, the Direct Request

Worksheet must clearly show any additional months for which the tenant still owes rent in order to substantiate the landlords' claim for any monies over and above the amount of rent as shown on the tenancy agreement.

As I am not able to confirm the precise amount of rent owing, the landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the landlords were partially successful in this application, I find that the landlords are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords 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 section 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlords a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlords are provided with this Order 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 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 landlords' 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 17, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch