



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Villa Rosalma
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR-PP, 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 December 23, 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 December 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

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 June 3, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,900.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2020;

- A copy of a Repayment Plan dated August 30, 2020 indicating the tenants would be responsible for repayment of affected rent in monthly installments of \$570.00 starting on October 1, 2020;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 3, 2020, for \$2,310.00 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 December 13, 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 tenants at 11:30 (am or pm not indicated) on December 3, 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 \$1,900.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with section 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were duly served with the 10 Day Notice on December 3, 2020.

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, December 13, 2020.

Policy Guideline #52 on COVID-19: Repayment Plans and Related Measures requires the landlord to issue a valid repayment plan dividing, the unpaid affected rent into equal installments.

The Guideline goes on to define affected rent as *“rent that becomes due to be paid by a tenant in accordance with a tenancy agreement during the “specified period” between March 18, 2020 and August 17, 2020”*

I find the Repayment Plan submitted by the landlord includes unpaid rent owing for September 2020, which is not considered affected rent. I find I am not able to confirm the validity of the Repayment Plan and for this reason, I find I cannot consider the

portion of the landlord's application for a Monetary Order related to the amounts listed on the Repayment Plan.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$600.00, the amount claimed by the landlord for unpaid rent owing for October 2020, November 2020, and December 2020, as of the date of this application, December 17, 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 \$700.00 for rent owed for October 2020, November 2020, and December 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 balance of the landlord's application for a Monetary Order 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: January 13, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch