



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 26, 2018, the landlord 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.

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 September 26, 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 \$2,500.00, due on the 15th day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 15, 2018;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim for unpaid rent. The landlord indicates that a balance of unpaid rent in the amount of \$700.00 was due by August 15, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated September 03, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on September 03, 2018, for \$2,500.00 in unpaid rent due on August 15, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of September 14, 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 on September 03, 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 September 03, 2018.

In a Direct Request proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue unpaid rent owed for a period beyond the due date for unpaid rent listed on the Notice issued to the tenant, in this case, August 15, 2018. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot consider the portion of the rental arrears arising from unpaid rent owed by September 15, 2018 and will therefore make a determination based on the amount of unpaid rent indicated as being due by August 15, 2018, as indicated on the Notice provided to the tenant.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the portion of the landlord's monetary claim for unpaid rent owing by September 15, 2018, with leave to reapply. I will only consider the landlord's application for a monetary Order related to unpaid rent arising from the September 03, 2018 Notice issued to the tenant, which alerted the tenant to unpaid rent due by August 15, 2018. According to the evidentiary material provided by the landlord, the amount of unpaid rent due by August 15, 2018 was \$2,500.00. The evidentiary material provided by the landlord further demonstrates that a partial payment of \$1,800.00 was provided by the tenant on September 12, 2018, resulting in a balance of unpaid rent owed by August 15, 2018 in the amount of \$700.00.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$2,500.00, 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 \$700.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed by August 15, 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 effective date of the Notice, September 14, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$700.00 for unpaid rent owed by August 15, 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 \$800.00 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: October 02, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch