

**Dispute Resolution Services** 

Residential Tenancy Branch Office of Housing and Construction Standards

# 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
- a Monetary Order for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the Act (\$1,300.00)
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant pursuant to section 72 of the Act (\$100.00)

## 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 of the Act. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the tracking number 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 D.N. was served on October 27, 2022, by registered mail, and is deemed to have received the Proceeding Package on November 1, 2022, the fifth day after the registered mailing.

#### Issue(s) 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? (\$1,300.00)

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 the landlord and the tenant, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,300.00, due on the first day of each month, for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2020;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated October 3, 2022, for \$1,300.00 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 October 13, 2022;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was sent to the tenant by registered mail at 8:13 pm on October 3, 2022;
- A copy of a Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the tracking number to confirm the 10 Day Notice was sent to the tenant on October 3, 2022;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

# Analysis

Section 46(4) of the Act states that within five days of a tenant receiving the 10 Day Notice, the tenant may either pay the rent or dispute the 10 Day Notice.

In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the Act, I find that the 10 Day Notice was served on October 3, 2022 and is deemed to have been received by the tenant on October 8, 2022, five days after its registered mailing.

I find that the fifth day for the tenant to have either paid the rent or disputed the notice was October 13, 2022. I further find that the earliest date that the landlord could have applied for dispute resolution was October 14, 2022.

I find that the landlord applied for dispute resolution on October 12, 2022, before the last day that the tenant had to dispute the 10 Day Notice and that the landlord made their application for dispute resolution too early.

Therefore, the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated October 3, 2022, is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

For the same reasons identified above, 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 unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the Act is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

The landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the Act is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

The landlord's application for authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant pursuant to section 72 of the Act is dismissed, 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: December 1, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch