



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 two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on July 9, 2015, the landlord served the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord 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. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “GG” and a signature for “GG” 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 tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 14, 2015, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

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:

- 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 “RG” on November 15, 2013, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,650.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2013. Although a second tenant, identified as “VG”, is named as a respondent on the application and is listed on the tenancy agreement, a signature for VG does not appear on the tenancy agreement. Therefore, I will consider the landlord’s application against the tenant RG only;
- 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 \$3,550.00 for outstanding rent owing for the period of April 2015 to June 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated June 29, 2015, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on June 29, 2015, for \$3,550.00 in unpaid rent due on June 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 8, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenants by way of personal service via hand-delivery to the tenant “RG” at 1:00 PM on June 29, 2015. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “GG” and a signature for GG 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 landlord 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 29, 2015.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,650.00, 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 \$3,550.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing for the period of April 2015 to June 2015. I find that the tenants received the Notice on June 29, 2015. I accept the landlord’s 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, July 9, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$3,550.00 for unpaid rent owing for the period of April 2015 to June 2015.

Although there are two tenants listed on the application and on the tenancy agreement, only the tenant RG is a signatory to the tenancy agreement; therefore, I will issue the orders against the tenant RG only.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord 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 landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$3,550.00 for unpaid rent owing for the period of April 2015 to June 2015. The landlord is 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: July 16, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

