



# 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 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 July 19, 2017, the landlord personally served Tenant K.M. 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 submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(1) of the *Act*, I find that Tenant K.M. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 19, 2017.

The landlord submitted a second signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on July 19, 2017, the landlord served Tenant S.Z. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by handing the documents to Tenant K.M. 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 submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(2) of the *Act*, I find that Tenant S.Z. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 19, 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 a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenants on March 27, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,875.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on March 27, 2017;
- A copy of a property management agreement showing the transfer of management responsibilities from the former landlord, who is named on the residential tenancy agreement, to the current landlord who is applying for dispute resolution;
- 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 July 6, 2017, and posted to the tenants' door on July 6, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 19, 2017, for \$1,875.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 1:02 pm on July 6, 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 July 9, 2017, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,875.00, 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 corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, July 19, 2017.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenants with the Notice of Direct Request proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per Section 89 of the *Act*.

Section 89(1) of the *Act* does not allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant.

Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant, only when considering an Order of Possession for the landlord.

I find that the landlord has served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to Tenant S.Z. by leaving a copy with Tenant K.M., an adult who resides with the tenant, and for this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application naming Tenant S.Z. is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,875.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for July 2017 as of July 19, 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.

Pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,875.00 for rent owed for July 2017. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant K.M. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant K.M. 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 for a Monetary Order naming Tenant S.Z. 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: July 21, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch