



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

### **Dispute Codes**

OPRM-DR

### **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 Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on January 22, 2018, the landlord’s agent “SR” served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided two copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service.

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 January 27, 2018, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

### **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:

- Two copies of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord's agent and the tenants on September 19, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,325.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on October 01, 2014;
- The landlord established the manner in which the monthly rent was raised from the initial \$1,325.00 stated in the tenancy agreement to the current amount of \$1,374.02 by providing a copy of a "Notice of Rent Increase" form provided to the tenant during the course of the tenancy;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$598.04 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the months of December 2017 and January 2018;
- A copy of a rental ledger which details the payments received and outstanding balance with respect to the tenancy;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated January 04, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on January 04, 2018, for \$1,374.02 in unpaid rent due on January 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of January 17, 2018;
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "SR" served the Notice to the tenant by way of leaving a copy in the mailbox or mail slot at the tenant's residence on January 04, 2018. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "CL" and a signature for "CL" is included on the form

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the Act which provides that the tenants had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenants did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenants did not pay the rental arrears.

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by way of leaving a copy in the mail box or mail slot at the tenants' residence, the tenants are deemed to have received the Notice three days after it was left in the mail box or mail slot. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants are deemed to have received the Notice on January 07, 2018, three days after it was left in the mail box or mail slot.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,374.02, as the landlord has established that the monthly rent amount was raised from the initial amount of \$1,300.00, as established in the tenancy agreement, to the current amount of \$1,374.02. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$598.04, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the months of December 2017 and January 2018.

I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenants did not pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not apply to dispute the 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 effective date of the Notice, January 17, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$598.04 for unpaid rent owing for the months of December 2017 and January 2018, as of January 19, 2018, the date on which the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request was submitted.

### 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 sections 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$598.04 for unpaid rent. The landlord is provided with these Orders 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 these Orders, these Orders may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as Orders 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: January 30, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch