



# 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 January 12, 2022.

### 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*?

### Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding – Direct Request

In this type of matter, the landlords must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding– Direct Request and all documents in support of the application in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 26, 2022, the landlords served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by handing the documents to Person T.M. The landlords had a witness and Person T.M. sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with section 89(2) of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were duly served to the tenant on January 26, 2021.

I note that section 89(1) of the *Act* does not allow for the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant.

Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant, only when considering an Order of Possession for the landlord.

I find that the landlords have served the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the tenant by leaving a copy with Person T.M., an adult who resides with the tenant. For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlords' application concerning unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

### Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by one of the landlords and the tenant on November 2, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,800.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2018
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$1,800.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,827.00
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated January 3, 2022, for \$1,827.00 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 January 13, 2022
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was signed by Person T.M. and indicates that the 10 Day Notice was handed to Person T.M., an adult who resides with the tenant, at 1:30 pm on January 3, 2022
- 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 \$1,827.00, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notice of Rent Increase.

In accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was duly served to the tenant on January 3, 2022.

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 13, 2022.

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

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: February 09, 2022

---

Residential Tenancy Branch