



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 6, 2021, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenant and a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord 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 May 6, 2021.

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 tenant on May 1, 2008, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,200.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2008

- A copy of six Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,200.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,405.00
- A copy of a Repayment Plan indicating the tenant would be responsible for repayment of affected rent in monthly installments of \$600 starting on October 1, 2020
- A copy of a Notice Terminating or Restricting a Service or Facility indicating the rent would be decreased to \$1,305.00 as of December 1, 2020
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated April 8, 2021, for \$12,210.00 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 April 18, 2021
- 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 5:00 pm on April 8, 2021
- A Direct Request Worksheet and ledger showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy

Analysis

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 April 8, 2021.

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, April 18, 2021.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of the date of this application, April 23, 2021.

I find that several of the Notice of Rent Increase forms have not been signed by the issuing landlord. I find I am not able to confirm the validity of these Notices of Rent Increase.

Furthermore, I find the Notice Terminating or Restricting a Service or Facility is not signed or dated by the landlord. I find I am not able to confirm whether the landlord provided the tenant the full 30 days' notice required under section 27(2)(a) of the *Act*.

Finally, I find the Repayment Plan is not signed or dated by the landlord. I find I am not able to confirm whether the landlord provided the tenant the full 30 days' notice required by Policy Guideline #52.

I find I am not able to confirm the precise amount of rent owing and for this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

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 section 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 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 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: May 20, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch