

## **DECISION**

### **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 the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution (Application) for:

- an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the Act
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant pursuant to section 72 of the Act (\$100.00)

### **Preliminary Matters**

---

I note that the spelling of the tenant's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution submitted by the landlord is slightly different than the spelling of the tenant's name shown on the tenancy agreement. Section 64(3)(c) of the Act allows me to amend the application to reflect both versions of the tenant's name, which I have done.

### **Service of Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request**

---

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Landlord's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that the tenant was served with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request (Proceeding Package) in accordance with section 89(2) of the Act. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service Landlord's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form to confirm this service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 90 of the Act:

- I find that Tenant C.A. was served on October 4, 2022, by posting to the door of the rental unit, and is deemed to have received the Proceeding Package on October 7, 2022, the third day after it's posting.

### **Issue(s) to be decided**

---

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant? (\$100.00)

## 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 evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenant on July 26, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,895.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on August 1, 2017;
- A copy of three Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,895.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$2,049.29, with the most recent increase being issued from the landlord who is applying for dispute resolution;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated September 2, 2022, for \$4,110.11 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 September 17, 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 5:18 (am or pm not indicated) on September 2, 2022;
- A Direct Request Worksheet and ledger showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

## Analysis

---

### **Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent?**

Section 46 of the Act requires that upon receipt of a 10 Day Notice the tenant must, within five days, either pay the full amount of the arrears as indicated on the 10 Day Notice or dispute the 10 Day Notice by filing an Application for Dispute Resolution with the Residential Tenancy Branch. If the tenant does not pay the arrears or dispute the 10 Day Notice they are conclusively presumed to have accepted the end of the tenancy pursuant to section 46(5) of the Act.

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 September 2, 2022 and is deemed to have been received by the tenant on September 5, 2022, three days after its posting.

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, September 17, 2022.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the Act.

**Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant?**

As the landlord was successful in their application, I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application, pursuant to section 72 of the Act.

## **Conclusion**

---

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord **effective two (2) days after service of this Order on the tenant**. Should the tenant or anyone on the premises fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

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 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.

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: November 8, 2022

---

Residential Tenancy Branch