



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DIRECT REQUEST DECISION**

### Dispute Codes :

OPR, MNR

### Introduction

The Hearing proceeded by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the Act, and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession and a monetary order for rental arrears.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on July 28, 2011, the landlord served each tenant in person with the Notice of Direct Request.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find the tenant has been duly served with the Dispute Resolution Direct Request Proceeding documents.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

The issues to be decided are whether the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order for rental arrears pursuant to 55 and 67 of the *Residential Tenancy Act (the Act)*. I have reviewed all documentary evidence.

### Proof of Service of 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy

The landlord submitted a copy of the Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent and a "Proof of Service" form stating that the Notice was served to the tenant by posting it on the door on July 13, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. in front of a witness.

The purpose of serving documents under the *Act* is to notify the person of a failure to comply with the Act and of their rights in response. The landlord, seeking to end the tenancy has the burden of proving that the tenant was served with the Notice to End Tenancy and I find that the landlord has met this burden.

### Analysis

Submitted into evidence was a copy of the tenancy agreement signed on April 1, 2011 showing rent set at \$1,200.00 per month. In the Application for Direct Request the landlord indicated that the tenant was in arrears for \$1,200.00 for the month of July

2011. Based on the evidence, I find the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation under section 67 in the amount of \$1,200.00 for unpaid rent.

In regard to the \$50.00 claim for costs and the return of the keys, I find that this is a matter that cannot be determined under a direct request. An application under section 55(4) only pertains to an Order of Possession and rent owed, and does not permit a monetary order for other damages or enforcement of other provisions of the Act. Therefore, I find I decline to consider these matters. The landlord is at liberty to make an application for a participatory hearing to deal with other damages and loss.

Based on the evidence submitted by the landlord, I find that the tenant was served with a Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent. The tenant has not paid all of the outstanding rent and did not apply to dispute the Notice and is therefore conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the Act to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice. Given the above facts I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession.

### **Conclusion**

I hereby issue an Order of Possession in favour of the landlord effective two days after service on the tenant. This order must be served on the Respondent and may be filed in the Supreme Court and enforced as an order of that Court.

I hereby issue a monetary order in favour of the landlord in the amount of \$1,200.00 for rental arrears. This order must be served on the tenant and may be enforced through Small Claims court if necessary.

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: August 09, 2011.

---

Residential Tenancy Branch