



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding 614039 BC LTD.  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **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 Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on March 14, 2017, the landlord personally served Tenant D.S. and Tenant N.R. the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices 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 D.S. and N.R. have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 14, 2017.

The landlord submitted a third signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 14, 2017, the landlord personally served Tenant N.B. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had Tenant N.B. and 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 N.B. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 14, 2017.

### 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 D.S., and Tenant N.R. on February 28, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,200.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on March 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 March 7, 2017, and personally served to the tenants on March 7, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 17, 2017, for \$900.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 11:10 am on March 7, 2017. The landlord had Tenant N.R. 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 7, 2017.

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 N.B., 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 N.B.

I note that the amount of rent on the tenancy agreement does not match the amount of rent being claimed on the 10 Day Notice. If there has been a rent increase, the appropriate Notice of Rent Increase forms must be submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution to substantiate the claim for the increased rent. I also find that the monthly breakdown of rent owing on the Monetary Order Worksheet does not match the amount of rent being claimed on the 10 Day Notice. For these reasons the monetary portion the landlord’s application is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

However, I accept the evidence before me that Tenant D.S. and Tenant N.R. 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 D.S. and Tenant N.R. 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 17, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing as of March 14, 2017.

### Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord 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.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order 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 21, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch