



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Capreit Limited Partnership
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, 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 Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on September 22, 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 September 27, 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

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 August 17, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,170.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on September 1, 2015;
- A copy of four Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,170.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$1,330.86;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated September 4, 2020, for \$1,365.86 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 September 17, 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 12:45 pm on September 4, 2020; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,330.86, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notices of Rent Increase.

In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on September 7, 2020, 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, September 17, 2020.

In a Direct Request Proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue rent owed for an amount beyond the amount noted on the 10 Day Notice that was issued to the tenant. I find the 10 Day Notice only lists amounts owing for September 2020. For this reason, I cannot hear the portion of the landlord's application for a monetary claim arising from rent owed from April 2020 to August 2020.

I also note that the only monetary award available to a landlord by way of the Direct Request process is for unpaid rent and unpaid utilities. As the landlord has also sought

a monetary award for matters relating to parking in the amount of \$35.00, I would not be able to consider this aspect of the landlord's claim through the Direct Request process.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$1,330.86, the amount claimed by the landlord for unpaid rent owing for September 2020, as of the date of this application, September 15, 2020.

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 sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,430.86 for rent owed for September 2020 and 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 parking and for unpaid rent owing from April 2020 to August 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: September 28, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch