



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs

DECISION

Dispute Codes Landlord: OPR, OPC, MNRL-S, MNDCL-S, LRSD, FFL
Tenant: CNC-MT, LRE

Introduction

This hearing dealt with cross Applications for Dispute Resolution filed by the parties. Both parties applied for multiple remedies, pursuant to the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "Act").

The Landlord attended the hearing and provided affirmed testimony. However, the Tenant did not.

Preliminary and Procedural Issues

Both parties were seeking multiple remedies under multiple sections of the *Act*, a number of which were not sufficiently related to one another. Section 2.3 of the Rules of Procedure states that claims made in an Application must be related to each other and that arbitrators may use their discretion to dismiss unrelated claims with or without leave to reapply.

After looking at the list of issues both parties applied for, and based on the evidence before me, I find the most pressing and related issues in this cross-application are related to the payment/non-payment of rent and the order of possession, whether or not the tenancy will continue, or end, based on the Notices issued. As a result, I exercise my discretion to dismiss, with leave to reapply, the Landlord's request for monetary compensation related to unpaid strata fines.

Tenant's Application

The hearing was by telephone conference and began promptly, as scheduled, at 9:30 AM Pacific Time on November 4, 2025, as per the Notice of a Dispute Resolution

Hearing provided to the parties. The line remained open while the phone system was monitored for 10 minutes and the only participant who called into the hearing during this time was the respondent Landlord who was ready to proceed. The Landlord stated that the Tenant continues to occupy the rental unit and not pay rent.

After the ten minute waiting period, the Tenant's application was **dismissed in full, without leave to reapply**.

Section 55 of the *Act* applies and states:

Order of possession for the landlord

55 (1) If a tenant makes an application for dispute resolution to dispute a landlord's notice to end a tenancy, the director must grant to the landlord an order of possession of the rental unit if

(a) the landlord's notice to end tenancy complies with section 52 [*form and content of notice to end tenancy*], and

(b) the director, during the dispute resolution proceeding, dismisses the tenant's application or upholds the landlord's notice.

(1.1) If an application referred to in subsection (1) is in relation to a landlord's notice to end a tenancy under section 46 [landlord's notice: non-payment of rent], and the circumstances referred to in subsection (1) (a) and (b) of this section apply, the director must grant an order requiring the payment of the unpaid rent.

[My emphasis added]

Under section 55 of the *Act*, when a Tenant's application to cancel a notice to end tenancy is dismissed and I am satisfied that the Notice to end tenancy complies with the requirements under section 52, I must grant the Landlord an order of possession. Section 52 of the *Act* requires that any notice to end tenancy issued by a landlord must be signed and dated by the landlord, give the address of the rental unit, state the effective date of the notice, state the grounds for ending the tenancy, and be in the approved form.

I find the 10 Day Notice issued in June 2025, complies with section 52 of the *Act*, in terms of the form and content requirements. As such, I find the Landlord is entitled to an order of possession, pursuant to section 55 of the *Act*. This order will be effective 7 days after it is served on the Tenant.

Next, I turn to section 55 (1.1) of the Act, which specifies that I must grant a monetary order for outstanding unpaid rent, provided a valid 10 Day Notice was issued, and if the Tenant's application to cancel the 10 Day Notice is dismissed.

The Landlord testified that the Tenant owes \$250.00 in rent from August, plus they owe full rent for September, October and November (3 x \$2,650.00). The Landlord testified that monthly rent is \$2,650.00 and is due on the first of the month. I find the Landlord is entitled to a monetary order for these amounts, as they remain unpaid. The Landlord is entitled to a monetary order of \$7,300.00.

Since the Landlord was successful, I award them the recovery of the filing fee paid. I also authorize the Landlord to deduct the security deposit of \$1,185.89, which includes interest payable, from what is owed.

In summary, I grant the monetary order based on the following:

<u>Claim</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Unpaid rent	\$7,300.00
Filing fee	\$100.00
Less: Security Deposit currently held by Landlord	(\$1185.89)
TOTAL:	\$6,214.11

Conclusion

Pursuant to section 55 of the Act, the Landlord is granted an order of possession effective **7 days after service** on the Tenant. This order must be served on the Tenant. If the Tenant fails to comply with this order the Landlord may file the order with the Supreme Court of British Columbia and be enforced as an order of that Court.

The Landlord is granted a monetary order pursuant to Section 67 in the amount of **\$6,214.11**. This order must be served on the Tenant. If the Tenant fails to comply with

this order the Landlord may file the order in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and be 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 04, 2025

Residential Tenancy Branch