Dispute Resolution Services

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 March 15, 2022.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 24, 2022, the landlords sent the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the tracking number to confirm this mailing.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on March 24, 2022 and are deemed to have been received by the tenant on March 29, 2022, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

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*?

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 one of the landlords and the tenant on May 10, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of $1,650.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2018

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 4, 2022, for $1,691.25 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 March 14, 2022

- 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 at 10:00 am on March 4, 2022

- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy. The Direct Request Worksheet noted that $591.25 of the $1,691.25 identified as owing in the 10 Day Notice was paid on March 2, 2022

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act,* I find that the 10 Day Notice was served on March 4, 2022 and is deemed to have been received by the tenant on March 7, 2022, three days after its posting.

I note that the address indicated on the 10 Day Notice from which the tenant must move is slightly different than the tenant address on the 10 Day Notice where documents are served, the tenancy agreement, the Application for Dispute Resolution and all other documents submitted with the landlord's application. I have amended this address to match all other information provided for the address as per section 68(1) of the *Act* as it is reasonable to do so under the circumstances.

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 sections 46(5) and 53(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, March 17, 2022.

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

I note that the amount of rent on the tenancy agreement ($1,650.00) does not match the amount of rent being claimed on the 10 Day Notice ($1,691.25). The Direct Request Worksheet must clearly show any additional months for which the tenant still owes rent; or, if there has been a rent increase, the appropriate Notice of Rent Increase forms must be submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution to substantiate the claim for the increased rent.

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 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: April 19, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch