



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding CORE HOLDINGS CORP.
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 and a Monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on February 28, 2017, the landlord posted the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice 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 tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 3, 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 Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on June 6, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$775.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on June 6, 2016;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy;
- The Monetary Order Worksheet noted that \$550.00 of the \$775.00 identified as owing in the 10 Day Notice was paid on February 15, 2017; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated February 2, 2017, and personally served to the tenant on February 2, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of February 12, 2017, for \$775.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 1:00 pm on February 2, 2017. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenant 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 section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on February 2, 2017.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$775.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant 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 the tenant is 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, February 12, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for February 2017 as of February 20, 2017.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. Should the tenant 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: March 06, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch