



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 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 January 10, 2020, 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 15, 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 utilities 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 was signed by the landlord and the tenants on June 25, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,350.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 1, 2019;

- A copy of a utility bill from the Corporation of the City of New Westminster for electricity charges for the rental unit dated August 8, 2019 for \$59.47;
- Two copies of a demand letter from the landlord to the tenants, dated November 21, 2019, requesting payment of utilities in the amount of \$59.47;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 29, 2019, for \$59.47 in unpaid utilities. 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 January 8, 2020;
- 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 3:06 pm on December 29, 2019; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and that such evidentiary material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

Section 46(6) of the *Act* allows a landlord to treat unpaid utilities as unpaid rent and end the tenancy by issuing a 10 Day Notice if

- (a) a tenancy agreement requires the tenant to pay utility charges **to the landlord**, and
- (b) the utility charges are unpaid more than 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for payment of them,

I note that the electricity bill from the City of New Westminster is in Tenant J.R.'s name and not the landlord's name. I also find that, while the tenancy agreement states that electricity is not included in the rent, the tenancy agreement not specify that the tenants are to pay the utilities to the landlord.

For this reason, I find the landlord is not entitled to end the tenancy for unpaid utilities. Therefore, the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice dated December 29, 2019 is dismissed without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated December 29, 2019 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reason identified above, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid utilities 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 to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice dated December 29, 2019 without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated December 29, 2019 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

The tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the *Act*.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid utilities 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 13, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch