

## **DECISION**

### **Preliminary Matter**

---

I note that the spelling of tenant C.C.'s name on the Application for Dispute Resolution submitted by the landlord is slightly different than the spelling of the tenant C.C.'s name shown on the tenancy agreement, the 10 Day Notice, and all other documents submitted with the Application. Section 64(3)(c) of the Act allows me to amend the application to reflect both versions of tenant C.C.'s name, which I have done.

### **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
- a Monetary Order for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the Act (\$12,000.00)
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenants pursuant to section 72 of the Act (\$100.00)

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

---

The landlord submitted a copy of two witnessed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on October 5, 2022 they served each tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request (Proceeding Package) by posting them to the door of the rental unit. In accordance with sections 89(2) and 90 of the Act and based on the written submissions and evidence of the landlord:

- I find that on October 5, 2022, the landlord served the tenants the Proceeding Packages by posting them to the door of the rental unit, and they are deemed to have been received by the tenants on October 8, 2022, the third day after they were posted to the door.

## Issues to be decided

---

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

Is the landlord entitled to a Monetary Order for unpaid rent? (\$12,000.00)

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenants? (\$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 the landlord and the tenants on December 1, 2021, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,500.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2021;
- a copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (the 10 Day Notice) dated August 26, 2022, for \$12,000.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 11, 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 tenants' door at 5:00 pm on August 26, 2022; and;
- a copy of a Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing during the relevant period.

## 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 August 26, 2022 and is deemed to have been received by the tenants on August 29, 2022, three days after it was posted to the door of the rental unit.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,500.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 tenants are 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 11, 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 a Monetary Order for unpaid rent?**

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

Section 89(1) of the Act does not allow for the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to be given to the tenants by attaching a copy to a door at the address at which the tenants reside.

Section 89(2) of the Act does allow for the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to be given to the tenants by attaching a copy to a door at the address at which the tenants reside, only when considering an Order of Possession for the landlord.

I find that the landlord has served the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the door of the rental unit at which the tenants reside, and for this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

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

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

## **Conclusion**

---

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord **effective two (2) days after service of this Order on the tenant(s)**. Should the tenant(s) 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.

Pursuant to section 72 of the Act, 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(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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.

The landlord's Application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the Act is dismissed, 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: November 22, 2022

---

Residential Tenancy Branch