



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on August 5, 2017, the landlords posted the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The landlords 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 landlords 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 August 8, 2017, the third day after their posting.

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*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords and the tenant on June 1, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$675.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 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 July 29, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of August 8, 2017, for \$395.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlords indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 11:50 am on July 29, 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 July 29, 2017.

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, August 8, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for July 2017 as of August 4, 2017.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords 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: August 10, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch