



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 Proceedings which declares that on September 14, 2016, the landlord personally served the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had a witness sign the respective Proofs of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for each tenant to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 14, 2016, the day it was personally served to them.

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 Notices of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and Tenant R.D. on May 25, 2013, indicating a monthly rent in the amount of \$1,150.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on May 15, 2013;

- 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 September 03, 2016, and posted to the tenants' door on September 03, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of September 14, 2016, for \$2,820.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door on September 03, 2016. 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 deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on September 06, 2016, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,150.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 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 10 Day Notice, September 16, 2016.

Direct request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability of the tenants to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied.

Section 46 (6) of the *Act* allows the landlord to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent, 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for them. I find that there is no written demand in the landlord's evidence submissions which would allow the landlord to treat the utilities as unpaid rent. For this reason the monetary portion of the landlord's application concerning unpaid utilities is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

I further find that Tenant B.D. has not signed the tenancy agreement, which is a requirement of the direct request process. For this reason the monetary portion of the landlord's application, naming Tenant B.D. as a respondent, is dismissed with leave to reapply

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order against Tenant R.D. in the amount of \$2,770.00, the amount of unpaid rent owing for July 2016, August 2016 and September 2016, as of September 14, 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 \$2,770.00 for rent owed for July 2016, August 2016 and September 2016. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant R.D. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant R.D. 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 monetary portion of the landlord's application, concerning unpaid utilities, with leave to reapply

I dismiss the monetary portion of the landlord's application, naming Tenant B.D. as a respondent, 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: September 15, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch