

# **Dispute Resolution Services**

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 landlords submitted two signed Proofs of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on January 7, 2021, the Landlord DS personally served Tenant SJ with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding and on January 8, 2021, Landlord DS personally served Tenant KK with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. Landlord DS had the tenant and a witness sign the respective Proofs of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for each tenant to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that TT SJ has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 7, 2021 and Tenant KK has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 8, 2021.

### 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*?

Are the landlords 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 landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by Landlord DS and by the tenants on May 1, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,050.00, due on the fourth day of each month for a tenancy commencing on May 4, 2017;
- A copy of an unsigned 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 16, 2020, for \$2,050.00 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 27, 2020;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally handed to Tenant DS on December 16, 2020; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

### <u>Analysis</u>

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

**52** 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 the 10 Day Notice is not signed by the landlord(s). I further find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlords have not complied with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlords' application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated December 16, 2020, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated December 16, 2020 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice, the landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

As the landlords were not successful in this application, I find that the landlords are not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

#### **Conclusion**

The landlords' application for an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated December 16, 2020, is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated December 20, 2020, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

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

I dismiss the landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlords' 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: February 01, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch