



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 form which declares that on November 20, 2018, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the tracking number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on November 25, 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 21, 2005 indicating a monthly rent of \$970.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on August 1, 2005;
- A copy of a Mutual Agreement Between the landlord and tenant dated October 29, 2010;
- Copies of Notice of Rent Increases;
- 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 in the amount of \$488.00 due by November 1, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated November 2, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on November 2, 2018, for \$488.00 due on November 01, 2018 with a stated effective vacancy date of November 15, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on November 2, 2018. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service of the Notice was witnessed and a name and signature for the witness are included on the 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 provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice three days after its posting, on November 5, 2018.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that 5 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 date of the 10 Day Notice, November 15, 2018.

Direct request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability of the tenants to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied. The onus is on the landlord to present evidentiary material that does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

I find that the monthly breakdown of rent owing on the Direct Request Worksheet is incomplete as the amount of rent on the tenancy agreement or the Notice of Rent Increase does not match the amount of rent being claimed on the 10 Day Notice. I find that \$488.00 is listed as owing on the 10 Day Notice but the monthly rent is \$1,425.00. In order to claim a monetary compensation, the Direct Request Worksheet must clearly show how the landlord arrived at their monetary claim, including any and all partial payments of rent.

I find that I am not able to determine how the landlord calculated the amount owing as \$488.00. For this reason, the landlord's application for a monetary Order based on unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing as of November 1, 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(s) fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order based on unpaid rent, with leave to reapply.

Pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 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: November 26, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch