



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on October 20, 2020, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on October 25, 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 tenant indicating a monthly rent of \$1,000.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on March 1, 2019;
- A copy of a Repayment Plan dated August 25, 2020 indicating the tenant would be responsible for repayment of affected rent in monthly installments of \$260.00 starting on October 1, 2020;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated October 2, 2020, for \$1,260.00 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 October 11, 2020;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was left in a conspicuous place at 12:40 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on October 2, 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 in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on October 5, 2020, three days after it was left in a conspicuous place.

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 tenant to have either paid the rent or disputed the notice was October 10, 2020, which was a Saturday. I also find that Monday, October 12, 2020 was Thanksgiving.

The Residential Tenancy Branch is closed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, meaning that the latest day on which the tenant could have disputed the 10 Day Notice was on Tuesday, October 13, 2020.

I further find that the landlord applied for dispute resolution on October 13, 2020, the last day that the tenant had to dispute the 10 Day Notice, and that the earliest date that

the landlord could have applied for dispute resolution was October 14, 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 based on the 10 Day Notice of October 2, 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 based on the 10 Day Notice of October 2, 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: October 30, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch