



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, OPRM-DR

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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 7, 2021, the landlords sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlords 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 January 12, 2021, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

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*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 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 landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by one of the landlords and the tenant on February 1, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$800.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on February 1, 2020;

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated October 12, 2020, for \$4,300.00 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 22, 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 tenant's door at 1:39 pm on October 12, 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 tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$800.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

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 15, 2020, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has 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 tenant is conclusively presumed under sections 46(5) and 53(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, October 25, 2020.

In a Direct Request Proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue rent owed for a period beyond the date on which the Notice was issued to the tenant. The 10 Day Notice was issued to the tenant on October 12, 2020. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot hear the monetary portion of the landlords' application for rent owed for November 2020.

Policy Guideline #52 provides the following information pertaining to the *COVID-19 Related Measures Act (the C-19 Act)*:

"Affected rent means 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"

The guideline goes on to state:

“A landlord cannot pursue an eviction for unpaid affected rent unless they have already given a valid repayment plan or there is a valid prior agreement still in effect.”

I find that the 10 Day Notice includes amounts owing from June 2020 to August 2020, which is considered affected rent. I also find that the landlords have not submitted a copy of a repayment plan or a valid prior agreement to demonstrate that they had the authority to issue a 10 Day Notice for the affected rent.

For this reason, I find I cannot consider the portion of the landlords' monetary claim for unpaid affected rent owing from June 2020 to August 2020.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$1,600.00, the amount claimed by the landlords for unpaid rent owing for September 2020 and October 2020, as of the date of this application, January 5, 2021.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. Should the tenant 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 section 67 of the *Act*, I grant the landlords a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,600.00 for rent owed for September 2020 and October 2020. The landlords are provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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 for unpaid rent 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 26, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch