



# 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 two signed Proof of Services of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 13, 2017, the Landlord sent both Tenants individual copies of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The Landlord provided copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these registered mailings.

Based on the written submissions of the Landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the Tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 18, 2017, the fifth day after their registered mailings.

### 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 a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the Landlord and the Tenants on September 18, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,200.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on October 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 September 2, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of September 11, 2017, for \$2,200.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the Landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was placed in the mailbox or mail slot at 11:15 a.m. on September 2, 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 on September 5, 2017, three days after being placed in the mailbox or mail slot.

I find that the Tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$2,200.00, 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 five days granted under section 46(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that five day period.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the Tenants have 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, September 15, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the Landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order in the amount of \$2,200.00, the amount claimed by the Landlord, for unpaid rent owing for September 2017 as of September 13, 2017.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the Landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the Tenant(s). Should the Tenant(s) 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 \$2,200.00 for rent owed for September 2017. The Landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and the Tenant(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the Tenant(s) 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.

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: September 20, 2017

---

Residential Tenancy Branch