



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPU-DR, MNU-DR, FFL

Preliminary Matters

I note that Application for Dispute Resolution submitted by the landlord includes two identical applicants (Person M.D.). Section 64(3)(c) of the *Act* allows me to amend the application to remove the duplicate applicant, 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 to obtain an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and utilities, to obtain monetary compensation for unpaid rent and utilities, 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 March 23, 2022.

The landlord submitted two signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on March 23, 2022, the landlord served each tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request in person. The landlord had the tenants and a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms 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 tenants on March 23, 2022.

Issue(s) to be Decided

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

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent and utilities 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

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 relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on June 1, 2021, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,250.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2021
- A copy of a utility bill from BC Hydro for the rental unit dated February 15, 2022 for \$647.88
- A copy of two utility bills from Fortis for the rental unit dated January 17, 2022 for \$143.75 and February 14, 2022 for \$46.32
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 2, 2022, for \$1,250.00 in unpaid rent and \$293.00 in unpaid utilities. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 12, 2022
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was served to the tenants in person at 4:00 pm on March 2, 2022
- A Direct Request Worksheet 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 tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,250.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was duly served to the tenants on March 2, 2022.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 tenants are 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 12, 2022.

Section 46 (6) of the *Act* allows the landlord to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent, 30 days after the tenants are given a written demand for them. I find that there is no 30-day written demand in the landlord's evidence submissions which would allow the landlord to treat the utilities as unpaid rent.

For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application concerning unpaid utilities is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$1,250.00, the amount claimed by the landlord for unpaid rent owing for March 2022.

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(s). Should the tenant(s) 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 \$1,350.00 for rent owed for March 2022 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(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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 utilities 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 13, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch