



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPU-DR, OPUM-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 January 21, 2021, 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 January 26, 2021, 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 July 1, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,750.00, due on the first day of each month;
- A copy of a utility bill from BC Hydro for the rental unit dated November 26, 2020 for \$957.53;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated January 6, 2021, for \$2,750.00 in unpaid rent and \$638.35 in unpaid utilities. 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 January 16, 2021;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was signed by Person K.L. and indicates that the 10 Day Notice was handed to Person K.L., an adult who resides with the tenant, on January 6, 2021; 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 \$2,750.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on January 6, 2021.

Section 68 of the *Act* allows for the 10 Day Notice to be amended when it is reasonable to do so. I find that the landlord's name does not appear on the 10 Day Notice, though the landlord signed the notice.

I further find that the tenant is not prejudiced by amending the 10 Day Notice to include the landlord's name as they are aware of the landlord's name as it appears on the signed tenancy agreement.

For this reason, I have amended the 10 Day Notice to include the landlord's name, reflecting the information on the tenancy agreement.

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 section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the 10 Day Notice, January 16, 2021.

Section 46 (6) of the *Act* allows the landlord to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent, 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for them. I find that there is no written demand in the landlord's evidence submissions which would allow the landlord to treat the utilities as unpaid rent.

For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application concerning unpaid utilities is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$2,750.00, the amount claimed by the landlord for unpaid rent owing for January 2021, as of the date of this application, January 12, 2021.

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. 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 sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$2,850.00.00 for rent owed for January 2021 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 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 landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid utilities 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: February 11, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch