



# 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 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 February 02, 2018, the landlord's agent "KB" 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. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by "LM" and a signature for "LM" is included on the form.

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 February 07, 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*?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 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 and the tenants on October 27, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,600.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on November 01, 2017;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes that there is unpaid rent owed in the amount of \$200.00 for November 2017; \$1,600.00 for December 2017 and \$1,600.00 for January 2018;

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated December 08, 2017, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on December 08, 2017, for \$1,600.00 in unpaid rent due on December 01, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of December 18, 2017;
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenants by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit at 3:24 PM on December 08, 2017. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "MB" and a signature for "MB" 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 relevant documentary evidence provided by the landlords. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice three days after its posting. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on December 11, 2017, three days after its posting.

The sum of the rent owed, as indicated by the monetary claim made by the landlord on the application form, and as indicated on the Direct Request worksheet, results in a balance of rent outstanding in the amount of \$3,400.00, comprised of unpaid rent owing for the period of November 01, 2017 to January 01, 2018.

In a Direct Request proceeding, a landlord cannot pursue unpaid rent owed for a period beyond the due date for unpaid rent listed on the Notice issued to the tenants, in this case, December 01, 2017. Therefore, within the purview of the Direct Request process, I cannot consider the portion of the rental arrears arising from unpaid rent owed for January 2018 and will therefore make a determination based on the amount of unpaid rent indicated as being due by December 01, 2017, as indicated on the Notice provided to the tenants.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the portion of the landlord's monetary claim for unpaid rent owing for January 2018, with leave to reapply. I will only consider the landlord's application for a monetary Order related to unpaid rent arising from the December 08, 2017 Notice issued to the tenants, which alerted the tenants to unpaid rent due by December 01, 2017. According to the evidentiary material provided by the landlord, the balance of unpaid rent due by November 01, 2017 was \$200.00, and the unpaid rent owed by December 01, 2017 was \$1,600.00, for a total of \$1,800.00.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,600.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$1,800.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for November 2017 and December 2017.

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 corrected effective date of the Notice, December 21, 2017.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,800.00 for unpaid rent owing for November 2017 and December 2017, as of February 01, 2018, the date on which the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request was submitted.

As the landlord was successful in this application, I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

#### 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 and 72 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$1,900.00 for unpaid rent, and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. 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: February 08, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch