



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding HARRON INVESTMENTS INC.  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **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 Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on February 24, 2017, the landlord posted the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The landlord had a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89(2) and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 27, 2017, the third day after their posting.

### 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:

- 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 Tenant D.C. on November 29, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$900.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 15, 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 February 3, 2017, and posted to the tenants' door on February 2, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of February 14, 2017, for \$900.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 1:00 pm on February 2, 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 February 5, 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.

Paragraph 12 (1) (b) of the Residential Tenancy Regulations establishes that a tenancy agreement is required to "be signed and dated by both the landlord and the tenant."

I find that the residential tenancy agreement submitted by the landlord is not signed by Tenant C.D., which is a requirement of the direct request process, and that a participatory hearing is necessary in order to protect the procedural rights of Tenant C.D.

Therefore, the landlord's application naming Tenant C.D. is dismissed with leave to reapply.

However, I find that Tenant D.C. was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$900.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that Tenant D.C. has 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 D.C. is 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, February 15, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for February 2017 as of February 21, 2017.

#### Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on Tenant D.C. Should Tenant D.C. fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

I dismiss the landlord's application naming Tenant C.D. 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: February 28, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch