



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 6, 2015, at 9:12 am, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents by leaving the documents at the tenant’s residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant. The landlord states that the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents were served at the rental unit, by way of hand-delivery, to the tenant’s brother “KS” and that the service was confirmed as KS acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by signing the Proof of Service form. The service was additionally confirmed as the Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “FL” and a signature for FL is included on the 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 served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 6, 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 September 30, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$650.00 due on the 1st day of the month for a tenancy commencing on October 1, 2014;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$860.00 for rent owing for December 2014 and January 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated January 27, 2015 (the Notice), which the landlord states was served to the tenant on January 27, 2015 for \$860.00 in unpaid rent due on January 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of February 8, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlords served the Notice to the tenant at 5:00 pm on January 27, 2015 by way of leaving the Notice at the rental unit with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant. The landlord states that the notice was served to an adult KS, the tenant's brother, who resides with the tenant and KS acknowledged receipt of the Notice by signing the Proof of Service form. The service was additionally confirmed as the Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "FL" and a signature for FL is included on the 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 the Notice on January 27, 2015.

Direct Request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability of the tenants to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per Section 89 of the *Act*.

Special rules for certain documents

- 89** (1) An application for dispute resolution or a decision of the director to proceed with a review under Division 2 of Part 5, when required to be given to one party by another, must be given in one of the following ways:
- (a) by leaving a copy with the person;
 - (b) if the person is a landlord, by leaving a copy with an agent of the landlord;
 - (c) by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, to the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;
 - (d) if the person is a tenant, by sending a copy by registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant;
- (2) An application by a landlord under section 55 [*order of possession for the landlord*], 56 [*application for order ending tenancy early*] or 56.1 [*order of possession: tenancy frustrated*] must be given to the tenant in one of the following ways:
- (a) by leaving a copy with the tenant;
 - (b) by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the tenant resides;
 - (c) by leaving a copy at the tenant's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant;
 - (d) by attaching a copy to a door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the tenant resides;

Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be left with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant only when considering the issuance of an Order of Possession for the landlord. As the landlord served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding in accordance with section 89(2)(c) of the *Act*, I have leave to hear only that part of the landlord's application that asks for an Order of Possession. I do not have leave to hear the landlord's application for a monetary Order. Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$650.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay \$860.00 in rental arrears comprised of \$210.00 outstanding rent owing for the month of December 2014 and \$650.00 outstanding rent owing for the month of

January 2015. I find that the tenant received the Notice on January 27, 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 corrected effective date of the Notice, February 8, 2015. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession.

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.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order 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: February 13, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

