



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 Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on July 27, 2015, the landlord personally served the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. 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 duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 27, 2015.

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 Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on September 25, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,200.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on October 1, 2014;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 14, 2015, and personally served to the tenants on July 14, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 24, 2015, for \$1,200.00 in unpaid rent and \$346.80 in unpaid utilities.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 11:10 am on July 14, 2015. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenants had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were duly served with the 10 Day Notice on July 14, 2015.

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and that such evidentiary material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and find that Tenant G.L.'s name on the Application for Dispute Resolution does not match the name on the tenancy agreement, 10 Day Notice or any of the other documentation that has been submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution.

As this is an *ex parte* proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, I have to be satisfied with the documentation presented that I am issuing the decision and orders in the correct name. For this reason, I dismiss the landlord's application naming Tenant G.L. with leave to reapply.

However, I find that tenant T.L. was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,200.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that Tenant T.L. has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that 5 day period.

Based on the foregoing, I find that Tenant T.L. is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the 10 Day Notice, July 24, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,200.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for June 2015 as of July 27, 2015.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on Tenant T.L. Should Tenant T.L., and any other occupant, 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 \$1,200.00 for rent owed for June 2015. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant T.L. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant T.L. fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order naming Tenant G.L. 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: July 31, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

