



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding The Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Caledon 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 June 3, 2022.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 17, 2022, the landlord served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request in person. The landlord had the tenant 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 June 17, 2022.

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

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 tenant, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,200.00, due on the twenty-eighth day of each month
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated May 1, 2022, for \$4,165.00 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 May 1, 2022
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was not signed by the tenant or a witness, indicating that the 10 Day Notice was served to the tenant in person at 5:10 pm on May 1, 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 landlord named on the 10 Day Notice does not match either the landlord named on the tenancy agreement, or the landlord named on the Application for Dispute Resolution.

I also note that section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

- 52** *In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must*
- (a) be signed and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,*
 - (b) give the address of the rental unit,*
 - (c) state the effective date of the notice...and*
 - (e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...*

I find that the 10 Day Notice is not signed by the landlord. I further find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not complied with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated May 1, 2022, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated May 1, 2022 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

As the landlord was not successful in this application, I find that the landlord is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession based on the 10 Day Notice dated May 1, 2022, is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice dated May 1, 2022, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

This tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the *Act*.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application, without 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: July 12, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch