



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 May 27, 2015, at 3:55 PM, the landlord “HT” served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the Proof of Service forms establish that the service was witnessed by “SH” and a signature for SH is included on each of the forms.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on May 27, 2015.

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 and the tenant “KM” on April 10, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$730.00 due on

the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on April 1, 2015. Although a second tenant, identified as "AM", is named as a respondent on the application and is listed on the tenancy agreement, a signature for "AM" does not appear on the tenancy agreement. Therefore, I will consider the landlord's application against the tenant "KM" only;

- 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 \$730.00 for unpaid rent for May 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated May 12, 2015, which the landlords state was served to the tenants on May 12, 2015 for \$730.00 in unpaid rent due on May 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of May 22, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord "HT" served the Notice to the tenants by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit at 2:00 PM on May 12, 2015. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "AW" and a signature for AW 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 provided by the landlords. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenants are 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 tenants are deemed to have received the Notice on May 15, 2015, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$730.00, 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 \$730.00 in rent for the month of May 2015. I find that the tenants received the Notice on May 15, 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 corrected effective date of the Notice, May 25, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$730.00 for unpaid rent owing for May 2015, as of May 27, 2015.

Although there are two tenants listed on the application and on the tenancy agreement, only the tenant "KM" is a signatory to the tenancy agreement; therefore, I will issue the orders against the tenant "KM" 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 \$730.00 for unpaid rent owing for May 2015, as of May 27, 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: June 03, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

