



# 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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlords submitted two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on March 16, 2017, the landlords personally served the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlords had the tenants sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlords 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 March 16, 2017.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

### Background and Evidence

The landlords 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 and the tenants on August 2, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$3,000.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on August 6, 2015;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent and utilities owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy;
- Two copies of utility bills from the BC Hydro for the rental unit dated November 30, 2016 for \$1,359.96 and February 1, 2017 for \$2,430.21 totaling \$3,790.17;
- Two copies of demand e-mails from the landlords to the tenants, dated December 7, 2016 and February 6, 2017, requesting payment of utilities; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 5, 2017, and personally served to the tenants on March 5, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 15, 2017, for \$6,000.00 in unpaid rent and \$2,844.81 in unpaid utilities.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlords indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 5:30 pm on March 5, 2017. The landlords had Tenant R.L. sign the Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy to confirm personal service. 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 section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were duly served with the 10 Day Notice on March 5, 2017.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$3,000.00, 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, March 15, 2017.

Section 46 (6) of the *Act* allows the landlords to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent, 30 days after the tenants are given a written demand for them. I find that the amount of utilities owed on the 10 Day Notice does not match the amount shown on the utility bills in the landlords' evidence submissions. I also note that the landlords' requests for payment were sent to the tenants by e-mail, which is not a recognized method of service under section 88 of the *Act*. For these reasons the monetary portion of the landlords' application concerning unpaid utilities is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$6,000.00, the amount claimed by the landlords, for unpaid rent owing for February 2017 and March 2017 as of March 16, 2017.

### Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenants. Should the tenants 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 landlords are entitled to a Monetary Order in the amount of \$6,000.00 for rent owed for March 2017. The landlords are provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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 landlords' application concerning unpaid utilities 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: March 17, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch