



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 October 12, 2016, the landlord sent the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. 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 October 17, 2016, 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 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 December 16, 2013, indicating a monthly rent in the amount of

\$925.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 01, 2012;

- Two copies of Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$925.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$950.00;
- 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 October 02, 2016, and left in the mailbox or mail slot at the tenant's residence on October 02, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of October 15, 2016, for \$850.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was left in the mailbox or mail slot at the tenant's residence at 5:20 p.m. on October 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 October 05, 2016, three days after being left in the mailbox or mail slot at the tenant's residence.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$950.00, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notice of Rent Increase forms. 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, October 15, 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.

I find that Tenant A.W. 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 A.W. 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 C.B. in the amount of \$850.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for October 2016, as of October 12, 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 \$850.00 for rent owed for October 2016. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant C.B. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant C.B. 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, naming Tenant A.W. 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: October 18, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch