



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 3, 2020, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by e-mail. The landlord provided a copy of three outgoing e-mails containing the attached supporting documents to confirm this service.

The Residential Tenancy Branch's Director's Order on e-mail service dated March 30, 2020 provides that a document required to be sent in accordance with sections 88 and 89 of the *Act* may be sent by e-mail if the sender and recipient e-mail addresses have been routinely used for tenancy matters.

The landlord submitted a copy of twenty e-mails exchanged between the landlord and the tenant, with the most recent e-mails dated March 17, 2020, showing that the landlord and tenant have regularly communicated by e-mail throughout the tenancy.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with the Director's Order, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 6, 2020, the third day after their e-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

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 landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on May 22, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,960.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2019;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated February 24, 2020, for \$2,000.00 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 March 6, 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 11:35 am on February 26, 2020; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy. The Direct Request Worksheet noted that, of the \$2,000.00 identified as owing in the 10 Day Notice, \$1,000.00 was paid on February 4, 2020 and \$500.00 was paid on February 6, 2020.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on February 29, 2020, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has 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 tenant is conclusively presumed under sections 46(5) and 53(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, March 10, 2020.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of the date of this application, March 16, 2020.

I note that the amount of rent on the tenancy agreement (\$1,960.00) does not match the amount of rent being claimed on the 10 Day Notice (\$2,000.00). The Direct Request Worksheet must clearly show any additional months for which the tenant still owes rent; or, if there has been a rent increase, the appropriate Notice of Rent Increase forms must be submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution to substantiate the claim for the increased rent.

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. Should the tenant 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 must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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: April 08, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch