



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding WESTSEA CONSTRUCTION
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 filed by the Landlord for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent and to recover the filing fee.

The Landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that they served the Tenant with a Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding and supporting documents in person on January 13, 2022. Receipt was acknowledged by the Tenant's signature. I find the Tenant was served with and received these documents on January 13, 2022.

Issues to be Decided

1. Is the Landlord entitled to an order of possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the Act?
2. Is the Landlord entitled to a monetary order for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 67 of the Act?
3. Is the Landlord entitled to recover the filing fee 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 signed residential tenancy agreement dated August 26, 2013, indicating a monthly rent in the amount of \$860.00 due on or before the first calendar day of each month, for a tenancy commencing on September 1, 2013;
- Copies of four partial Notices of Rent Increase (pages 1 of 2 only);
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities dated December 8, 2021, for \$2,225.00 in unpaid rent (the 10 Day Notice). 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 December 22, 2021;
- A copy of a signed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy document which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was served on the Tenant by attaching a copy to the door of the Tenant's residence on December 8, 2021, which service was witnessed by W.M.; and
- A copy of a Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent due and paid during the relevant period.

Analysis

In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the Act, I find that the Tenant is deemed to have received the 10 Day Notice on December 11, 2021, three days after it was attached to the Tenant's door.

I find the 10 Day Notice complies with the form and content requirements of section 52 of the Act.

I accept the evidence before me that the Tenant failed to pay the rent owed in full and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within five days after receipt in accordance with section 46(4) of the Act.

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 December 21, 2021, the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice.

Therefore, I find the Landlord is entitled to an order of possession which will be effective two days after it is served on the Tenant.

With respect to the Landlord's claim for unpaid rent, the onus is on the Landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and that such evidentiary material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the Landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

In this case, I have examined the documents submitted and find that the Landlord has submitted four partial Notices of Rent Increase. These documents do not include the second page which sets out the date of the notice, the effective date of the increase, and the amount of the increase. Therefore, I find there is insufficient evidence before me to support a finding that the rent increases during the tenancy (from \$860.00 per month to \$975.00 per month) were imposed in accordance with the Act.

While I accept that the Tenant did not pay rent in full or dispute the 10 Day Notice within five days after receipt, I find that the precise amount of rent due has not been substantiated. As a result, I am not able to determine the precise amount of rent owing. For this reason, the Landlord's request for a monetary order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the Landlord is partially successful, I find they are entitled to a monetary award in the amount of \$100.00 in recovery of the filing fee paid to make the application.

Conclusion

The Landlord is granted an order of possession which will be effective two days after it is served on the Tenant. The order of possession must be served on the Tenant. The order of possession may be filed and enforced as an order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

The Landlord's request for a monetary order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The Landlord is granted a monetary order in the amount of \$100.00 in recovery of the filing fee for this application. The monetary order must be served on the Tenant. The monetary order may be filed in and enforced as an order of the Provincial Court of British Columbia (Small Claims).

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 28, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch