



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 April 11, 2016, at 6:36 PM, the landlord’s agent “KH” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant 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 “CH” and a signature for “CH” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 11, 2016.

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 tenant;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord's agent and the tenant on November 07, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,094.00 due on the last day of the month preceding the month for which rent is due, for a tenancy commencing on December 01, 2014. Although an individual identified as "KH" is included on the application for dispute resolution as an applicant landlord, "KH" is not listed as a landlord on the tenancy agreement. As neither the name nor signature for "KH" appears on the tenancy agreement to demonstrate that "KH" entered into a tenancy agreement with the tenant, I will consider the application with the entity "MDL" being the sole landlord;
- The landlord established the manner in which the monthly rent was raised from the initial \$1,094.00 stated in the tenancy agreement to the current amount of \$1,121.00 by providing a copy of a "Notice of Rent Increase" form provided to the tenant during the course of the tenancy;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$1,121.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing as of March 31, 2016 for the month of April 2016;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated April 01, 2016, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on April 01, 2016, for \$1,121.00 in unpaid rent due on March 31, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of April 11, 2016; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "KH" served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on April 01, 2016. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "CH" and a signature for "CH" is included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the *Act* which provides that the tenant 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 tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenant is 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 tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on April 04, 2016, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,121.00, as established in the "Notice of Rent Increase" form provided to the tenant during the course of the tenancy. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay outstanding rental arrears in the amount of \$1,121.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing as of March 31, 2016 for the month of April 2016. I find that the tenant received the Notice on April 04, 2016. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenant did not pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not apply to dispute the Notice within that five-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 Notice, April 14, 2016.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,121.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing as of March 31, 2016 for the month of April 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.

Pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$1,121.00 for unpaid rent. The landlord is provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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: April 13, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch