



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding BELMONT PROPERTIES
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR, FFL

Preliminary Matters

I note that the Application for Dispute Resolution submitted by the landlord shows a spelling for the rental unit's street name that is slightly different than the correct spelling 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 match the tenancy agreement and the 10 Day Notice, 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 an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 3, 2019, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenant sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 3, 2019.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on January 29, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,150.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on February 1, 2019;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 11, 2019, for \$1,170.00 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 March 21, 2019;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was signed by the tenant and indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 11:12 am on March 11, 2019; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy. The Direct Request Worksheet noted that \$200.00 of the \$1,170.00 identified as owing in the 10 Day Notice was paid on March 27, 2019.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on March 11, 2019

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,150.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

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, March 21, 2019.

I note that the only monetary award available to a landlord by way of the direct request process is for unpaid rent and unpaid utilities. As the landlord has also sought a monetary award for matters relating to a parking fee in the amount of \$20.00, I would not be able to consider this aspect of the landlord's claim through the direct request process.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$950.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for March 2019 as of April 1, 2019.

As the landlord was partially successful in this 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 days after service of this Order** on the tenant. Should the tenant 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 sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,050.00 for rent owed for March 2019 and 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.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for a parking fee 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: April 05, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch