

Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

<u>Dispute Codes</u> OPR-DR

<u>Introduction</u>

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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on November 16, 2020, the landlords personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlords had the tenant and a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission of the landlords and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on November 16, 2020.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords and the tenant on April 17, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,700.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on April 17, 2020;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice)
 dated November 2, 2020, for \$1,700.00 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 November 12, 2020;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 10:02 am on November 2, 2020; and

Page: 2

• A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

<u>Analysis</u>

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on November 2, 2020.

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 November 7, 2020, which was a Saturday. The Residential Tenancy Branch is closed on Saturdays and Sundays, meaning that the latest day on which the tenant could have disputed the 10 Day Notice was on Monday, November 9, 2020.

I further find that the landlords applied for dispute resolution on November 8, 2020, before the last day that the tenant had to dispute the 10 Day Notice, and that the earliest date that the landlords could have applied for dispute resolution was November 10, 2020. The landlords made their application for dispute resolution too early.

Therefore, the landlords' application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession based on of the 10 Day Notice of November 2, 2020, is dismissed with leave to reapply.

<u>Conclusion</u>

I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice of November 2, 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: December 02, 2020

2			
Residential	Tenancy	Branch	