



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

The landlords submitted two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on March 11, 2015, the landlords served the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlords provided two copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received 5 days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 16, 2015, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

### Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following evidentiary material:

- Two copies of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord “RN” and the tenant “MR” on May 8, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,350.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on May 6, 2014. Although the tenant “LR” is named as a respondent on the application, a signature for LR does not appear on the tenancy agreement. There is a second landlord listed on the application, identified as “DN”, however the full name of DN does not appear on the tenancy agreement and there is no signature for DN on the tenancy agreement;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlords establish a monetary claim in the amount of \$2,700.00 for unpaid rent, which is comprised of rent owing in the amount of \$1,350.00 for February 2015 and rent owing in the amount of \$1,350.00 for March 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated March 5, 2015, which the landlords state was served to the tenants on March 5, 2015 for \$2,700.00 in unpaid rent due on March 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 15, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord RN served the Notice to the tenants by way of personal service via hand-delivery to the tenant MR at 6:00 pm on March 5, 2015. The Proof of Service establishes that the service was witnessed by “DN” and a signature for DN is included on the form.

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 or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenants did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlords alleged that the tenants 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 tenants were duly served with the Notice on March 5, 2015.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,350.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay outstanding rental arrears in the amount of \$2,700.00 in rent owed for the months of February 2015 and March 2015. I find that the tenants received the Notice on March 5, 2015. I accept the landlords’ undisputed evidence and find that the tenants 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 tenants are conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice, March 15, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$2,700.00 for unpaid rent owing for February 2015 and March 2015.

Although there are two landlords listed on the application, only the complete name and signature of the landlord "RN" is included on the tenancy agreement, and I will therefore issue an order listing only RN as the landlord. Similarly, only the tenant "MR" is a signatory to the tenancy agreement; therefore, I will issue an order against the tenant MR only.

### Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant(s). 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 landlords are entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$2,700.00 for unpaid rent owing for February 2015 and March 2015. The landlords are provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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: March 17, 2015

---

Residential Tenancy Branch

