



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Brown Bros. Agencies Ltd  
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 Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declares that on July 22, 2020, the landlord personally served each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenants and a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 22, 2020.

### 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 tenants on March 21, 2013, indicating a monthly rent of \$815.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on April 1, 2013;
- A copy of five Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$815.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$916.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 6, 2020, for \$1,807.00 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 March 19, 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 10:00 am on March 6, 2020; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet and ledger showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

### 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 March 9, 2020, three days after its posting.

Section 46 (4) of the *Act* states that, within five days of a tenant receiving the 10 Day Notice, the tenant may either pay the rent or dispute the 10 Day Notice.

The definition of days in the Residential Tenancy Branch Rules of Procedure states that: "If the time for doing an act in a government office (such as the Residential Tenancy Branch or Service BC) falls or expires on a day when the office is not open during regular business hours, the time is extended to the next day that the office is open".

I find that the fifth day for the tenants to have either paid the rent or disputed the notice was March 14, 2020, which was a Saturday. The Residential Tenancy Branch is closed on Saturdays and Sundays, meaning that the latest day on which the tenants could have disputed the 10 Day Notice was on Monday, March 16, 2020.

I further find that the landlord applied for dispute resolution on March 9, 2020, before the last day that the tenants had to dispute the 10 Day Notice, and that the earliest date that the landlord could have applied for dispute resolution was March 17, 2020. The landlord made their application for dispute resolution too early.

Therefore, the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of March 6, 2020, is dismissed with leave to reapply.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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 for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of March 6, 2020 with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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: July 23, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch