



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR

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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which declares that on March 14, 2020 the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 19, 2020, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Although three additional individuals identified as “SCC”, “KJF”, and “JC” are included on the application for dispute resolution as applicant landlords, none of the individuals identified as “SCC”, “KJF”, and “JC” are listed as landlords on the tenancy agreement. As neither the names nor signatures for either “SCC”, “KJF”, or “JC” appear on the tenancy agreement to demonstrate that “SCC”, “KJF”, and “JC” entered into a tenancy agreement with the tenant, I will consider the application with “SC” being the sole landlord, and amend the application, in accordance with section 64(3)(c), to exclude “SCC”, “KJF”, and “JC” as parties to this dispute.

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*?

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.

On the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, the landlord seeks an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent in the amount of \$11,900.00.

The landlord submitted, in part, the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,700.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on May 01, 2019;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing during the relevant portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes that there is a cumulative balance of unpaid rent owed by March 01, 2020 in the amount of \$11,900.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the months encompassing the period of September 2019 to March 2020;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated February 18, 2020, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on February 18, 2020, for \$10,200.00 in unpaid rent due on February 01, 2020, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 02, 2020; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on February 18, 2020. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service of the Notice was witnessed and a name and signature for the witness are included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the *Act* which provides that the tenant had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice three days after its posting. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on February 21, 2020, three days after its posting.

In a Direct Request proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue unpaid rent owed for a period beyond the due date for unpaid rent listed on the Notice issued to the tenant, in this case, February 01, 2020. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot consider the portion of the rental arrears arising from unpaid rent owed for the month of March 2020, and will therefore make a determination based on the amount of unpaid rent indicated as being due as noted on the February 18, 2020 Notice provided to the tenant.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the portion of the landlord's monetary claim for unpaid rent owing for the month of March 2020, with leave to reapply. I will only consider the landlord's application for a monetary Order related to unpaid rent arising from the February 18, 2020 Notice issued to the tenant, which alerted the tenant to unpaid rent due by February 01, 2020 in the amount of \$10,200.00.

According to the Direct Request worksheet provided by the landlord, the tenant was required to pay a cumulative balance of rental arrears in the amount of \$10,200.00 by February 01, 2020, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the months encompassing the period of September 2019 to February 2020.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,700.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the cumulative balance of rental arrears due by February 01, 2020, in the amount of \$10,200.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the months comprising the period of September 2019 to February 2020.

I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenant did not pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not apply to dispute the Notice within that five-day period.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenant is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice, March 02, 2020.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$10,200.00 for the cumulative balance of unpaid rent owed by February 01, 2020, as claimed on the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. 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 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$10,200.00 for unpaid rent. The landlord is provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant fail to comply with these Orders, these Orders may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as Orders of that Court.

I dismiss the portion of the landlord's monetary claim for unpaid rent owing for the month of March 2020, 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: March 20, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch