



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding CENTURY 21 ENERGY REALTY  
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 January 31, 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 are deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 5, 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 June 1, 2017, indicating a monthly rent

of \$2,300.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2017;

- A copy of a letter of termination and a service agreement showing the transfer of management responsibilities from the former landlord, who is named on the residential tenancy agreement, to the current landlord who is applying for dispute resolution;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 10, 2019, for \$3,840.00 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 3:10 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on December 10, 2019; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet and ledger showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy. The ledger noted that, of the \$3,840.00 identified as owing in the 10 Day Notice, \$500.00 was paid on December 11, 2019 and \$1,000.00 was paid on December 16, 2019.

### 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 13, 2019, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 tenants are 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 23, 2019.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of the date of this application, January 30, 2020.

I find that the breakdown of amounts owing on the ledger includes monthly water charges. I further find that the ledger does not clearly identify which portion of the outstanding amount is for unpaid rent and which portion is for unpaid water charges.

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

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 the tenant(s). Should the tenant(s) 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 landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenant(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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 landlord's 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: February 06, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch