

Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

<u>Dispute Codes</u> OPRM-DR, FFL

<u>Introduction</u>

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 January 25, 2020, 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 January 30, 2020, 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

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 landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

Page: 2

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the one of the landlords and the tenant on May 11, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,700.00, due on the eleventh day of each month for a tenancy commencing on May 11, 2018;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$1,700.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,742.50;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice)
 dated January 12, 2020, for \$1,742.50 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 January 23, 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 tenant's door at 7:58 pm on January 12, 2020; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

<u>Analysis</u>

Section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

- 52 In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must
- (a) **be signed** and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,
- (b) give the address of the rental unit,
- (c) state the effective date of the notice...and
- (e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the 10 Day Notice is not signed by either of the landlords. I find the landlords typed a name into the signature field but did not sign the document.

I further find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlords have not complied with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlords' application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice dated January 12, 2020, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated January 12, 2020 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

Page: 3

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice, the landlords' application for a

Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

As the landlords were not successful in this application, I find that the landlords are not

entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

The landlords' application for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice

dated January 12, 2020, is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated January 12, 2020, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

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

I dismiss the landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, with leave to

reapply.

I dismiss the landlords' 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: February 03, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch