



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding ASSOCIA BRITISH COLUMBIA,  
INC 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 30, 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 will be deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 4, 2020, 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 relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which names a landlord who is not the applicant and was signed by the tenants on January 31, 2014, indicating a monthly

rent of \$800.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on February 1, 2014;

- A copy of a Certificate of Change of Name and a letter showing the change of landlord name from the landlord named on the residential tenancy agreement to the landlord applying for dispute resolution;
- A copy of four Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$800.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$909.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 13, 2019, for \$929.00 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 23, 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 tenants' door at 5:20 pm on December 13, 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 tenants were deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on December 16, 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 tenants to have either paid the rent or disputed the notice was December 21, 2019, which was a Saturday. 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, December 23, 2019.

I further find that the landlord applied for dispute resolution on December 23, 2019, the last day that the tenants had to dispute the 10 Day Notice, and that the earliest date that the landlord could have applied for dispute resolution was December 24, 2019. The landlord made their application for dispute resolution too early.

Therefore, the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of December 13, 2019, is dismissed with leave to reapply.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed 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

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of December 13, 2019 with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application 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: January 03, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch