



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Brown Bros. Agencies Ltd
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

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 landlord 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 landlord on December 21, 2021.

The landlord submitted two signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on December 31, 2021, the landlord sent each tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by e-mail. The landlord provided a copy of the outgoing e-mails containing the Direct Request documents as attachments to confirm this service. The landlord also submitted a copy of an Address for Service form which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on June 10, 2021, indicating the tenants agreed to receive documents by e-mail.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 43(2) and 44 of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on December 31, 2021 and are deemed to have been received by the tenants on January 3, 2022, the third day after their e-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

The landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,450.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 1, 2021
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 8, 2021, for \$657.50 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 21, 2021
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 4:16 pm on December 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 I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,450.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was served on December 8, 2021 and is deemed to have been received by the tenants on December 11, 2021, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 tenants are 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, December 21, 2021.

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

I find the amounts owing and paid in the Direct Request Worksheet add up to a balance owing of \$647.50. However, the amounts listed on the ledger indicate a balance owing of \$657.50.

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(s). Should the tenant(s) 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 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(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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: January 25, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch