



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPUM-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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 23, 2019, the landlords sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlords 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 January 28, 2019, 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 landlords and the tenant on November 14, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,700.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2018;
- A copy of an e-mail from BC Hydro for the rental unit dated January 4, 2019 for \$36.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated January 5, 2019, for \$1,700.00 in unpaid rent, \$1,700.00 in unpaid deposits, and \$36.00 in unpaid utilities. 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 January 15, 2019;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 5:30 pm on January 5, 2019; 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 January 8, 2019, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,700.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

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 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, January 18, 2019.

I note that the only monetary award available to a landlord by way of the direct request process is for unpaid rent and unpaid utilities. As the landlords have also sought a monetary award for matters relating to a security deposit in the amount of \$1,700.00, I would not be able to consider this aspect of the landlords' claim through the direct request process.

Section 46 (6) of the *Act* allows the landlord to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent, 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for them. I find that there is no written demand in the landlords' evidence submissions which would allow the landlord to treat the utilities as unpaid rent. For this reason the monetary portion of the landlords' application concerning unpaid utilities is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$1,700.00, the amount claimed by the landlords, for unpaid rent owing for January 2019 as of January 18, 2019.

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. 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 landlords a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,800.00 for rent owed for January 2019 and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlords are 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 matters relating to unpaid utilities and unpaid deposits, 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: January 29, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch