



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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 15, 2016, the landlord left the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89(2) of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed duly with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 15, 2016, 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 tenants;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on February 28, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$5,300.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on February 01, 2014;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 02, 2016, and sent by registered mail to the tenant on March 02, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 12, 2016, for \$22,160.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was sent by registered mail to the tenant at 4:48 p.m. on March 02, 2016. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenant 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 tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on March 07, 2016, five days after its mailing.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$5,300.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant 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 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 10 Day Notice, March 17, 2016.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenants 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(1) of the *Act* does not allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant.

Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant, but only when considering the Order of Possession.

I find that the landlord has served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by leaving it with an adult who resides with the tenant, and for this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of March 15, 2016.

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 18, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch

