



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding OFFWEST HOLDINGS LTD  
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 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 March 18, 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 March 23, 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 tenant, indicating a monthly rent of \$670.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 1, 2016;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$670.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$690.00;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$710.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$735.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 5, 2019, for \$735.00 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 15, 2019;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 8:00 pm on March 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 section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on March 5, 2019.

Section 68 of the *Act* allows for the 10 Day Notice to be amended when it is reasonable to do so. I find that the address from which the tenant must vacate does not match with the tenant's address for service of documents on the 10 Day Notice, the tenancy agreement, or any of the other documents submitted. I further find that the tenant is not prejudiced by amending the address as they are aware of what their correct address is on the signed tenancy agreement. For this reason I have amended the address on the

10 Day Notice from which the tenant must vacate to reflect the address on 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 section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the 10 Day Notice, March 15, 2019.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for March 2019 as of March 18, 2019.

I note that the landlords have submitted Notices of Rent Increase showing the rent being adjusted from \$670.00 to \$690.00 and from \$710.00 to \$735.00; however, I find the landlords have not submitted a copy of a Notice of Rent Increase or any other documentation to show why there was a change in rent from \$690.00 to \$710.00.

I find that I am not able to confirm the precise amount of rent owing and for this reason the landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

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 section 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlords a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 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 landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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: March 25, 2019

---

Residential Tenancy Branch