



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding METRO VANCOUVER HOUSING CORPORATION 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 March 15, 2022.

The landlord submitted a copy of two Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on March 23, 2022, the landlord sent each tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of two Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the tracking numbers to confirm they served the tenants.

Based on the written submissions and evidence of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89(1) and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on March 23, 2022 and are deemed to have been received by the tenants on March 28, 2022, the fifth day after they were mailed.

Issues 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

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 August 13, 2007, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,355.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on October 1, 2007;
- a copy of thirteen Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,355.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,992.00;
- a copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (the “10 Day Notice”) dated March 4, 2022, for \$6,055.00 in unpaid rent. 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 14, 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 by leaving a copy in the tenants’ mail slot at 12:46pm on March 4, 2022;
- a copy of an order dated September 8, 2008, that shows the name change of the landlord; and;
- a copy of a Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing during the relevant period.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was served on March 4, 2022 and is deemed to have been received by the tenants on March 7, 2022, three days after it was left in the tenants' mail slot.

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 sections 46(5) and 53(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, March 17, 2022.

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

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. I find that the tenant ledger submitted by the landlord includes NSF charges and a Replacement FOB fee. I find I am not able to determine what portion of the landlord's monetary claim is comprised of unpaid rent and what portion is NSF charges and a Replacement FOB charge.

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(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 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(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.

The landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed 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