



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding PW COMOX DEVELOPMENT
LP 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 two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on December 16, 2019, the landlord sent each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants are deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on December 21, 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

I have reviewed all written submissions and evidence before me; however, only the evidence and submissions relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

The landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and Tenant A.R. on April 4, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$3,110.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on May 1, 2017;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 3, 2019, for \$18,050.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 December 14, 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 tenants at 5:00 pm on December 3, 2019; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

Paragraph 12 (1) (b) of the Residential Tenancy Regulation establishes that a tenancy agreement is required to be “signed and dated by both the landlord and the tenant.”

I find that Tenant S.R. has not signed the tenancy agreement, which is a requirement of the direct request process. For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord’s application naming Tenant S.R. as a respondent is dismissed without leave to reapply.

However, I find that Tenant A.R. was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$3,110.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that Tenant A.R. was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on December 3, 2019.

I accept the evidence before me that Tenant A.R. 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 Tenant A.R. 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, December 14, 2019.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$18,050.00, the amount claimed by the landlord for unpaid rent owing from May 2019 to December 2019, as of the date of this application, December 11, 2019.

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 Tenant A.R. Should Tenant A.R. **and any other occupant** 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 landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$18,150.00 for rent owed from May 2019 to December 2019 and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant A.R. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant A.R. 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 portion of the landlord's application for a Monetary Order naming Tenant S.R. as a respondent 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: December 23, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch