



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR

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.

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 to confirm personal service for each tenant. 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*?

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 the tenants on February 28, 2014, indicating a monthly rent in the amount of \$950.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on March 01, 2014;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during this tenancy. The Monetary Order Worksheet noted that \$460.00 of the \$1,325.00 identified as owing in the 10 Day Notice was paid since the 10 Day Notice was issued to the tenant; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated September 02, 2016, and posted to the tenant’s door on September 02, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of September 15, 2016, for \$1,325.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant’s door on September 02, 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 05, 2016, three days after its posting. I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$950.00, 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 effective date of the 10 Day Notice, September 15, 2016.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for 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.

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 19, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch