



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Glass Manor  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR-DR, MNR-DR, FFL

### 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 to obtain an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, to obtain monetary compensation for unpaid rent, and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

This decision is written based on the Application for Dispute Resolution, evidence, and submissions provided by the landlord on August 12, 2021.

The landlord submitted a Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which was signed on September 1, 2021 and declares that the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request. The landlord had the tenant and a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form to confirm personal service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were duly served to the tenant on September 1, 2021.

### 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 relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on November 22, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,700.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on December 16, 2017
- A copy of two Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,700.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,787.00
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated August 6, 2021, for \$5,037.00 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 August 16, 2021
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 12:25 pm on August 6, 2021
- A Direct Request Worksheet and ledger showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,787.00, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notices of Rent Increase.

In accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was duly served to the tenant on August 6, 2021.

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, August 16, 2021.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent.

The Direct Request Worksheet must clearly show all months for which the tenant still owes rent in order to substantiate the landlord's claim.

I find that the monthly breakdown of rent owing on the Direct Request Worksheet is incomplete as the landlord has indicated the monthly rent owing for June 2021 was \$3,250.00. I also find that the ledger is incomplete as there's an unexplained returned cheque charge in the amount of \$3,569.87.

I find I am not able to confirm the particulars of the landlord's monetary claim and for this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

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 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 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 unpaid rent 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: September 16, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch