



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR-DR, MNR-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 landlords to obtain an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, to obtain monetary compensation for unpaid rent, and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

This decision is written based on the Application for Dispute Resolution, evidence, and submissions provided by the landlords on July 17, 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*?

### Service of Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding – Direct Request

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on July 29, 2021, the landlords personally served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request. The landlords had the tenant sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were duly served to the tenant on July 29, 2021.

### 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 the landlords and the tenant on February 1, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,550.00, 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 June 14, 2021, for \$1,000.00 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 June 25, 2021
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was handed to the tenant's son on June 14, 2021
- A copy of a text message from the tenant dated June 15, 2021, confirming they received the 10 Day Notice
- A copy of two Direct Request Worksheets

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,550.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I find that the 10 Day Notice was served to the tenant on June 15, 2021, the day the tenant acknowledged receiving the notice.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full by June 20, 2021, 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, June 25, 2021.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent.

I find the landlords have submitted two different versions of the Direct Request Worksheet. On one copy of the form, the landlords have indicated that the tenant paid \$1,000.00 of the \$1,000.00 owing for June on July 2, 2021. On the other version, the landlords have indicated that the tenant made two payments towards the June rent in the amount of \$550.00 on June 18, 2021 and \$150.00 on June 19, 2021.

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

As the landlords were partially successful in this application, I find that the landlords are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

### 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 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlords a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. 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 landlords' 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: August 16, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch