



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR, FFL

Introduction

This participatory hearing was convened after the issuance of an August 20, 2018, interim decision by an Adjudicator. The Adjudicator determined that the landlord's application could not be considered by way of the Residential Tenancy Branch's (RTB) direct request proceedings, as had been originally requested by the landlord. Pursuant to section 58 of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the *Act*), I was designated to hear this matter. The Adjudicator reconvened the landlords' application to a participatory hearing for the following:

- an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*;
- a monetary order for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*; and
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant pursuant to section 72.

The tenants did not attend this hearing, although I waited until 11:15 a.m. in order to enable the tenant to connect with this teleconference hearing scheduled for 11:00 a.m.

The landlord's agent (the landlord) attended the hearing and was given a full opportunity to be heard, to present sworn testimony, to make submissions and to call witnesses.

Rules 7.1 and 7.3 of the RTB Rules of Procedure provides as follows:

Commencement of the hearing - The hearing must commence at the scheduled time unless otherwise decided by the arbitrator. The arbitrator may conduct the hearing in the absence of a party and may make a decision or dismiss the application, with or without leave to re-apply.

The landlord testified that they sent the tenant a copy of the notice of this adjourned hearing by registered mail on August 21, 2018. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Tracking Number to confirm this registered mailing. In accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the notice of this hearing on August 26, 2018, the fifth day after its registered mailing.

The landlord provided written evidence that the Application for Dispute Resolution (the Application), along with all supporting evidence was served to the tenant by posting it to the door of the rental unit on August 10, 2018, as a part of the direct request proceeding package. In accordance with sections 88, 89 (2) and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were deemed served with the Application and supporting evidence on August 13, 2018.

The landlord requested to amend their Application for a monetary award from \$4,050.00 to \$10,350.00 due to rent owing since the Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) was issued to the tenants. Residential Tenancy Branch Rule of Procedure 4.2 states that in circumstances that can reasonably be anticipated, such as when the amount of rent owing has increased since the time the Application for Dispute Resolution was made, the application may be amended at the hearing.

I allowed this amendment to the landlord's monetary application for additional rent as it is clear that the tenants would have known that additional rent for the rental unit had become owing since the landlord submitted his application for dispute resolution.

Issues(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent?

Is the landlord entitled to a monetary award for unpaid rent?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenants?

Background and Evidence

The landlord gave written evidence that this tenancy began on February 01, 2018, with a monthly rent of \$2,100.00. The landlord gave undisputed affirmed testimony that the rent is due on the first day of each month. The landlord testified that they continue to retain a security deposit in the amount of \$2,100.00.

The landlord provided written evidence that a 10 Day Notice was posted to tenants' door on July 30, 2018. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was deemed served to the tenants on August 02, 2018.

A copy of the signed 10 Day Notice dated July 30, 2018, identifying \$4,050.00 in rent owing for this tenancy, with an effective date of August 09, 2018, was included in the landlord's evidence.

A copy of a Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid from May 2018 to July 2018 was also included in the landlord's evidence.

The landlord testified that the tenants are still in the rental unit and that no money has been paid towards the amount owing on the 10 Day Notice since the 10 Day Notice was issued. The landlord confirmed that they are seeking an Order of Possession.

The landlord's amended application for a monetary award of \$10,350.00 is comprised of unpaid monthly rent from May 2018 to October 2018.

Analysis

Section 26 of the *Act* requires a tenant to pay rent to the landlord, regardless of whether the landlord complies with the *Act*, regulations or tenancy agreement, unless the tenant has a right to deduct all or a portion of rent under the *Act*.

Based on the landlord's evidence and undisputed testimony, I find that the tenants failed to pay any rent within five days of receiving the 10 Day Notice and did not make an application pursuant to section 46(4) of the *Act* within five days of receiving the 10 Day Notice. I find that, due to the failure of the tenants to take either of these actions within five days, the tenants are conclusively presumed to have accepted the end of this tenancy on August 12, 2018, the corrected effective date on the 10 Day Notice pursuant to sections 46(5) and 53 (2) of the *Act*. In this case, the tenants and anyone on the premises were required to vacate the premises by August 12, 2018. As this has not occurred, I find that the landlord is entitled to a two (2) day Order of Possession.

Section 67 of the *Act* establishes that if damage or loss results from a tenancy, an Arbitrator may determine the amount of that damage or loss and order that party to pay compensation to the other party. Based on the above and the undisputed written evidence and affirmed testimony, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary award of \$10,350.00 for unpaid rent owing for this tenancy from May 2018 to October 2018.

Although the landlord's application does not seek to retain the tenants' security deposit, using the offsetting provisions of section 72 of the *Act*, I allow the landlord to retain the tenants' security deposit plus applicable interest in partial satisfaction of the monetary award. No interest is payable over this period.

As the landlord has been successful in this application, I also allow them to recover the filing fee from the tenant.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenants. Should the tenant(s) or anyone on the premises 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 67 of the *Act*, I grant a monetary Order in the landlord's favour under the following terms, which allows the landlord to recover unpaid rent, to recover the filing fee and to retain the tenants' security deposit:

Item	Amount
Unpaid May 2018 Rent	\$1,050.00
Unpaid June 2018 Rent	900.00
Unpaid July 2018 Rent	2,100.00
Unpaid August 2018 Rent	2,100.00
Unpaid September 2018 Rent	2,100.00
Unpaid October 2018 Rent	2,100.00
Less Deposit	-2,100.00
Filing fee for this Application	100.00
Total Monetary Order	\$8,350.00

The landlord is 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 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: October 05, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch