



# 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 May 10, 2015, the landlord’s agent “JV” served each of 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 five days after 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 deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on May 15, 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's agent and the tenants on February 11, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,200.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on March 01, 2015;
- 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 \$2,400.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing for the months of April 2016 and May 2016;
- A letter dated August 21, 2015, which demonstrates that the landlord indicated in the tenancy agreement had transferred the responsibilities and duties of the landlord to the applicant landlord with respect to the building in which the rental unit is located. The letter to the tenants directs the tenants to pay rent to the new landlord;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated April 04, 2016, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on April 04, 2016, for \$1,200.00 in unpaid rent due on April 01, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of April 15, 2016; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "JV" served the Notice to the tenants by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit at 8:00 AM on April 04, 2016. The Proof of Service establishes that the service was witnessed by "MP" and a signature for "MP" 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 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 tenants are 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 tenants are deemed to have received the Notice on April 07, 2016, three days after its posting.

I find that there is a discrepancy in the amount of outstanding rent established by the landlord, as the amount listed on the application for dispute resolution and landlord's monetary order worksheet is different than the amount indicated on the Notice issued to the tenants. The sum of the rent owed, as indicated on the monetary worksheet and application form, results in a balance of rent outstanding in the amount of \$2,400.00,

which is comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing for April 2016 in the amount of \$1,200.00, and unpaid rent owed for May 2016 in the amount of \$1,200.00.

However, the Notice issued to the tenants on April 04, 2016 is in the amount of \$1,200.00 for unpaid rent due by April 01, 2016. In a Direct Request proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue unpaid rent owed for a period beyond the date on which the Notice was issued to the tenants, in this case, April 04, 2016. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot consider the portion of the rental arrears arising from unpaid rent owed for May 2016 and will therefore make a determination based on the amount of unpaid rent indicated on the Notice provided to the tenants.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the portion of the landlord's monetary claim for unpaid rent owing for May 2016, with leave to reapply. I will only consider the landlord's application for a monetary Order related to unpaid rent arising from the April 04, 2016 Notice issued to the tenants, which alerted the tenants to unpaid rent, in the amount of \$1,200.00, which was due on April 01, 2016.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,200.00, 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 \$1,200.00 comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing for the month of April 2016. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenants 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 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, April 17, 2016.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,200.00 comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing 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(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 \$1,200.00 for unpaid rent. 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: May 16, 2016

---

Residential Tenancy Branch