



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Housing

A matter regarding Maple Leaf Property Management and
[tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, MNR-DR, FFL

Introduction

This hearing dealt with an application by the landlord pursuant to the Residential Tenancy Act (the “Act”) for the following orders:

1. an Order of Possession, pursuant to section 55;
2. a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, pursuant to section 67; and,
3. authorization to recover the filing fee paid for this application, pursuant to section 72.

SC appeared as agent for the landlord.

SC testified that they served the tenant with the Notice of Reconvened Hearing, the interim decision, and all other required documents on March 24, 2023, by registered mail. In support of this, SC provided a Canada Post Tracking Number.

Based on the uncontested affirmed testimony of the landlord and in accordance with section 88 and 90 of the Act, I find that the required documents were served on the tenant on March 24, 2023, and are deemed to have been received by the tenant on March 29, 2023, the fifth day after they were sent by registered mail.

SC confirmed they were not recording the hearing pursuant to Rule of Procedure 6.11. The landlord was given full opportunity under oath to be heard, to present evidence and to make submissions.

The tenant did not appear at the hearing. The hearing proceeded in the tenant's absence pursuant to Rule of Procedure 7.3.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession?

Is the landlord entitled to a Monetary Order for unpaid rent?

Background and Evidence

While I have considered the documentary evidence and the testimony of SC not all of the details of their submissions and evidence are reproduced here. The relevant and important aspects of the landlord's claims and my findings are set out below.

SC provided affirmed testimony that the tenancy began on September 21, 2021. Rent is \$2,340.00 due on the first day of the month. The landlord collected a security deposit of \$1,147.50 which they continue to hold in trust. A copy of the written tenancy agreement is submitted into evidence.

SC testified that they served the 10-Day Notice to End Tenancy on the tenant on January 6, 2023, by attaching it to the door of the rental unit. In support of this, SC included a Proof of Service document indicating the same. Page two of the Notice indicates that the tenant did not pay rent in the amount of \$6,915.00 that was due on January 1, 2023.

SC testified that the tenant paid \$2,265.00 of the \$2,295.00 rent that was due in September 2022. Since that time, the tenant has not paid any rent. In January 2023, rent increased from \$2,295.00 to \$2,340.00. Rent is currently outstanding in the amount of \$16,275.00.

SC testified that they reached out to the tenant in mid-October when they realized there was a problem; however, they were not able to contact the tenant. SC testified that they ramped up their efforts to get a hold of the tenant in December 2022 and January 2023, contacting the tenant by phone and email and reaching out to their emergency contact.

SC testified that they are unsure if the tenant is still residing in the unit. SC entered the unit on April 17th, 2023, for a fire inspection. At that time, there were very few items left in the rental unit; however, some furniture remained in the unit. SC testified that the tenant's key fob was last used to enter the rental unit on April 18, 2023.

SC testified that the landlord is seeking an Order of Possession and Monetary Order in the amount of \$16,275.00 in outstanding rent.

HP was called as a witness and indicated that he agrees with whatever statements SC made during the hearing.

Analysis

Based on the uncontested affirmed testimony of SC and in accordance with section 89 and 90 of the Act, I find that the 10-Day Notice was served on the tenant on January 6, 2023, and is deemed to have been received by the tenant on January 9, 2023, the third day after it was posted to the door of the rental unit.

Section 26(1) of the Act requires a tenant to pay rent when it is due under the tenancy agreement whether or not the landlord complies with the Act, regulations, or the tenancy agreement.

Section 46(1) of the Act permits a landlord to end a tenancy if rent is unpaid on any day after the day it is due by issuing a 10-Day notice to end tenancy which must comply with section 52 (form and content) of the Act. Upon receipt of a notice to end tenancy issued under section 46 of the Act, a tenant has 5 days to either pay the overdue rent or file an application disputing the notice as per section 46(4). If a tenant fails to comply with the requirements of the notice, section 46(5) is triggered such that the tenant is conclusively presumed to have accepted the end of the tenancy and must vacate the rental unit by the effective date of the notice.

The 10-Day Notice states that it was issued because the tenant failed to pay rent in the amount of \$6,915.00. However, based on the records of the landlord, at the time the Notice was issued, rent was outstanding in the amount of \$9,255.00. As a result, I find that the 10-Day notice was issued for an incorrect amount. Nevertheless, I find that the 10-Day Notice was issued for a valid reason, namely, the tenant's non-payment of rent.

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 corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, January 19, 2023, pursuant to section 53(2) of the Act.

Section 55(2)(c) of the Act permits a landlord to request an Order of Possession when a notice to end the tenancy has been given by the landlord, the tenant has not made an

application to dispute the notice, and the time for making any such application has expired.

In this case, the landlord served the Notice in accordance with the Act, the Notice complies with section 52 of the Act, and the tenant has not made an application to dispute the Notice. As such, I find that the landlord has proven on a balance of probabilities that they are entitled to an Order of Possession.

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession pursuant to section 55(4)(a) of the Act. A copy of the Order of Possession is attached to this Decision and must be served on the tenant. The tenant has two days to vacate the rental unit from the date of service or deemed service.

I also grant the landlord a Monetary Order requiring the payment of the outstanding rent in the amount of \$16,275.00 in accordance with section 55(4)(b) of the Act.

The landlord continues to hold the tenant's security deposit in trust. In accordance with the off-setting provisions of section 72 of the Act, I order the landlord to retain the tenant's security deposit in partial satisfaction of the Monetary Order.

Conclusion

The landlord is granted an Order of Possession which will be effective two days after service upon the tenant. The Order of Possession may be filed in and enforced as an order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

I issue a Monetary Order in the landlord's favour in the amount of \$15,227.50 as follows:

Item	Amount
Rent due September 2022	\$30.00
Rent due October, November, December 2022 (3 x \$2,295.00)	\$6,885.00
Rent due January, February, March, and April 2023 (4 x \$2,340.00)	\$9,360.00

Filing Fee	\$100.00
Security Deposit	-\$1,147.50
Total Monetary Order	\$15,227.50

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: May 2, 2023

Residential Tenancy Branch