



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Dorset Realty Group
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

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 for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on February 2, 2015, at 7:00 am, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by signing the Proof of Service form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 3, 2015.

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*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on March 15, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,400.00 due on the 1st day of the month for a tenancy commencing on April 1, 2014;

- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$2,800.00 comprised of \$1,400.00 in rent owing for December 2014 and \$1,400.00 in rent owing for January 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated January 23, 2015 (the Notice) which the landlord states was served on the tenant on January 23, 2015 for \$2,800.00 in unpaid rent due on January 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of February 2, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of personal service via hand-delivery on January 23, 2015 at 6:00 pm. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant acknowledged receipt of the Notice by signing the Proof of Service form.

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

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and find that in accordance with section 88 of the *Act* the tenant was served with this 10 Day Notice on January 23, 2015.

I find that on the tenancy agreement, the name of the city in which the rental unit is located is not identified. However, this deficiency is corrected by virtue of the fact that the city is listed on the supporting documents included with the application, such as the Proof of Service of the Notice and Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, both of which were personally acknowledged and signed for by the tenant. The name of the city is also included on the Notice itself, as well as the application for dispute resolution by Direct Request. Accordingly, I find that any deficiency that may arise by not having the name of the city identified on the tenancy agreement is addressed by the consistency with which the complete address of the rental unit is identified in the supporting documents included as part of this application.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,400.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay \$1,400.00 in rent for the month of December 2014 and has failed to pay \$1,400.00 in rent for the month of January 2015. I find that the tenant received the Notice on January 23, 2015. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenant did not pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not apply to dispute the Notice within that 5-day period.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenant is 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, February 2, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$2,800.00 for unpaid rent owing for December 2014 and January 2015, as of January 30, 2015.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. 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 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$2,800.00 for rent owed for December 2014 and January 2015, as of January 30, 2015. The landlord is provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant fail to comply with these Orders, these Orders may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as Orders of that Court.

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: February 10, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

