



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR, FFL

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 October 27, 2017, the landlords posted the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The landlords had a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices 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 tenants are deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on October 30, 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*?

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

Are the landlords entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 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 landlord and the tenants on April 5, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,200.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on April 15, 2017;
- 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 August 2, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of August 12, 2017, for \$1,600.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlords indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 1:00 pm 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 its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,200.00, 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 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, September 15, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for July 2017 and August 2017 as of October 10, 2017.

In this type of matter, the landlords 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 attaching a copy to a door at the address at which the tenant resides.

Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by attaching a copy to a door at the address at which the tenant resides, only when considering an Order of Possession for the landlord.

I find that the landlords have served the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit at which the tenants reside, and for this reason, the monetary portion of the landlords' application is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords 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.

I dismiss the landlords' 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: October 31, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch