



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Royal Villa Ent. Ltd
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 a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on October 23, 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 28, 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 on September 28, 2012, indicating a monthly rent of \$950.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on October 1, 2012;
- A copy of two Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$950.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,012.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated October 3, 2020, for \$1,012.00 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;
- 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 1:30 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on October 3, 2020; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

Section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must
(a) be signed and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,
(b) give the address of the rental unit,
*(c) **state the effective date of the notice...**and*
(e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that there is no effective date (the day when the tenant must move out of or vacate the site) on the 10 Day Notice. I find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not complied with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. It is possible to amend an incorrect date on the 10 Day Notice, but the *Act* does not allow an adjudicator to input a date where none is written.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated October 3, 2020, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated October 3, 2020, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

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

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated October 3, 2020, is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated October 3, 2020, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

This tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the *Act*.

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: November 09, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch