



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 landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 11, 2015, at 12:20 PM, the landlord "DM" served the tenant "KS" with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant "KS" acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by signing the Proof of Service form. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by "GW" and a signature for GW is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant "KS" has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on June 11, 2015.

The landlords have not provided a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form for the tenant "RK" and have not established that tenant "RK" has been served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. Therefore, I dismiss the landlords' application against the tenant "RK" with leave to reapply. I will hear the landlords' application against tenant "KS" only.

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:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant “KS”;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the male landlord “DM” and the tenants on October 6, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,100.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on November 1, 2014;
- 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 \$1,100.00 for unpaid rent for the month of June 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated June 2, 2015, which the landlords state was served to the tenants on June 2, 2015 for \$1,100.00 in unpaid rent due on June 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of June 13, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the male landlord “DM” served the Notice to the tenants by way of personal service via hand-delivery to the tenant “KS” at 11:00 AM on June 2, 2015. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant “KS” acknowledged receipt of the Notice by signing the Proof of Service form. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “DS” and a signature for DS 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 June 2, 2015.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,100.00, 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 \$1,100.00 in rent for the month of June 2015. I find that the tenants received the Notice on June 2, 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, June 13, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,100.00 for unpaid rent owing for June 2015, as of June 9, 2015.

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 \$1,100.00 for unpaid rent owing for June 2015, as of June 9, 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 15, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

