

Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding PARADISE PARK LESSEES ASSOCIATION OSOYOOS 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 March 11, 2022.

The landlord submitted a witnessed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which declares that on March 17, 2022, the landlord served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by posting it to the door of the rental unit.

Based on the written submissions and evidence of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89(2) and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on March 17, 2022 and are deemed to have been received by the tenant on March 20, 2022, the third day after they were posted to the door.

Issues 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

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 residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on December 14, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,350.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on January 1, 2017;
- a copy of two Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,350.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,425.00;
- a copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (the "10 Day Notice") dated January 24, 2022, for \$2,625.00 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;
- a copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door on January 24, 2022; and;
- a copy of two Direct Request Worksheets showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant period.

<u>Analysis</u>

Section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must (a) be signed and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,

(b) give the address of the rental unit,

(c) state the effective date of the notice...and

(e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that there is no effective date (the day when the tenant must move out of or vacate the site) on the 10 Day Notice. I find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not complied with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. It is possible to amend an incorrect date on the 10 Day Notice, but the *Act* does not allow an adjudicator to input a date where none is written.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated January 24, 2022, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated January 24, 2022, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

As the landlord was not successful in this application, I find that the landlord is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated January 24, 2022, is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated January 24, 2022, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

This tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the Act.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application without 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: April 08, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch