



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding TOP VISION REALTY
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 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 March 14, 2019, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlord 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 March 19, 2019, 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 January 10, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,500.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on January 15, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 2, 2019, for \$2,500.00 in unpaid rent. 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 March 11, 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 10:30 am on March 2, 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 March 5, 2019, three days after its posting.

Section 46 (4) of the *Act* states that, within five days of a tenant receiving the 10 Day Notice, the tenant may either pay the rent or dispute the 10 Day Notice.

The definition of days in the Residential Tenancy Branch Rules of Procedure states that: "If the time for doing an act in a business office falls or expires on a day when the office is not open during regular business hours, the time is extended to the next day that the office is open".

I find that the fifth day for the tenant to have either paid the rent or disputed the notice was March 10, 2019, which was a Sunday. The Residential Tenancy Branch is closed on Saturdays and Sundays, meaning that the latest day on which the tenant could have disputed the 10 Day Notice was on Monday, March 11, 2019.

I further find that the landlord applied for dispute resolution on March 10, 2019, before the last day that the tenant had to dispute the 10 Day Notice, and that the earliest date

that the landlord could have applied for dispute resolution was March 12, 2019. The landlord made their application for dispute resolution too early.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of March 2, 2019, with leave to reapply.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice, I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

As the landlord was not successful in this application, I find that the landlord is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of March 2, 2019 is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

The landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application is dismissed without 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: March 20, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch