



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding ARGUS PROPERTIES LTD.
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 March 11, 2015, at 1:25 pm, the landlord’s agent “SS” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “DS” and a signature for DS is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 14, 2015, the third day after their posting.

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’s agent and the tenant on January 6, 2015 indicating a monthly rent of \$725.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on January 9, 2015;

- 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 \$725.00, comprised of rent owing in the amount of \$725.00 for February 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated February 23, 2015, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on February 23, 2015, for \$825.00 in unpaid rent due on February 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 9, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "EB" served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit at 12:10 pm on February 23, 2015. The Proof of Service establishes that the service was witnessed by "MS" and a signature for MS 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 provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the Act provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice three days after its posting. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the Act, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on February 26, 2015, three days after its posting.

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. Section 89 reads, in part, as follows:

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 attached to the door of the rental unit 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)(d) 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.

Although I do not have leave to hear the landlord's application for a monetary Order, I find that there is a discrepancy in the amount of outstanding rent listed on the monetary order worksheet and the Notice issued to the tenant. The Notice issued to the tenant indicates that the tenant owed rent in the amount of \$825.00, while the monetary Order worksheet establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$725.00 arising from unpaid rent for February 2015. The amount of \$825.00 provided on the Notice is based on monthly rent owed in the amount of \$725.00 (which the landlord does note on the Notice), a \$50.00 NSF fee, and a \$50.00 late fee. As these fees cannot be claimed as part of the monetary claim sought via the Direct Request process, I will make a determination based on the amount indicated on the monetary order worksheet and the amount of rent established in the tenancy agreement.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$725.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay \$725.00 in rent for the month of February 2015. I find that the tenant received the Notice on February 26, 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, March 8, 2015. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession based on the Notice served to the tenant for unpaid rent owing for February 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.

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: March 16, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

