



Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of 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 for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on November 8, 2012, the landlord personally served each of the tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents.

Issues to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an order of possession?

Is the landlord entitled to a monetary order for unpaid rent?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant C.E. on July 15, 2012, indicating that the tenant is obligated to pay \$975.00 in rent in advance on the first day of the month;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the "Notice") which the landlord served on the tenants on October 10, 2012 for \$975.00 in unpaid rent due in the month of October; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice on the tenants by posting it on the door of the rental unit.

Section 90 of the Act provides that because the Notice was served by posting, the tenants are deemed to have received the Notice 3 days later on October 13, 2012.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the Act which provides that the tenants had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution. The tenants did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenants did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

Because the tenancy agreement was signed only by C.E. and not by D.E., I find that any orders issued must be issued against C.E. alone as there is insufficient evidence to show that D.E. had a contractual relationship with the landlord. I therefore dismiss the claims as against D.E.

I find that C.E. received the Notice on October 13, 2012. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and I find that C.E. did not pay the rental arrears and did not apply to dispute the Notice and is therefore conclusively presumed to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice. I grant the landlord an order of possession which must be served on the tenants. Should the tenant fail to comply with the order, it may be filed for enforcement in the Supreme Court. I note that although the order is issued only against C.E., it is effective against C.E. and anyone who takes occupancy under C.E.'s tenancy.

I accept the evidence before me that C.E. has failed to pay \$975.00 in rent for the month of October. I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the rental arrears and I grant the landlord a monetary order for \$975.00. This order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an order of that Court.

Conclusion

I grant the landlord an order of possession and a monetary order for \$975.00.

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: November 29, 2012

Residential Tenancy Branch