



# Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## EX PARTE PROCEEDING

### (DIRECT REQUEST PROCEEDING)

Pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*, the decision in this matter was made without a participatory hearing. The decision was based on an undisputed 10 day Notice to End Tenancy and the written submissions of the Landlord.

## 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 January 21, 2017, the landlord personally served Tenant T.K. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that Tenant T.K. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 21, 2017.

The landlord submitted two more signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on January 21, 2017, the landlord sent Tenant

A.P. and Tenant J.G. the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt 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 Tenant A.P. and Tenant J.G. have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 26, 2017, 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:

- A copy of the Proofs 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, Tenant T.K., and Tenant A.P. on November 1, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,500.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on November 1, 2016;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated January 9, 2017, and posted to the tenants' door on January 9, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of January 19, 2017, for \$2,500.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 4:00 pm on January 9, 2017. 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 January 12, 2017, three days after its posting.

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and that such evidentiary material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

I find that Tenant J.G. is not named on the 10 Day Notice or on the residential tenancy agreement submitted by the landlord. I note that there is a third signature on the addendum to the tenancy agreement, but no printed name to confirm whose signature appears on the document.

I find that I am unable to confirm that Tenant J.G. signed the tenancy agreement, which is a requirement of the Direct Request Process, and that a participatory hearing is required to protect the procedural rights of Tenant J.G.

The landlord's application naming Tenant J.G. is dismissed with leave to reapply.

However, I find that Tenant T.K. and Tenant A.P. were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$2,500.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that Tenant T.K. and Tenant A.P. 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 Tenant T.K. and Tenant A.P. 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, January 22, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$2,500.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for January 2017 as of January 20, 2017.

### Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on Tenant T.K. and Tenant A.P. Should Tenant T.K. and Tenant A.P. 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 \$2,500.00 for rent owed for January 2017. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant T.K. and Tenant A.P. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant T.K. and Tenant A.P. 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 landlord's application naming Tenant J.G. 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: January 26, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch