



# 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 Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on February 15, 2018, the landlord “AS” served the tenants “RK” and “MK” with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The Proof of Service forms also establishes that the service was witnessed by “MS” and a signature for “MS” is included on the forms.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants “RK” and “MK” have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 15, 2018.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on February 14, 2018, the landlord “AS” served the tenant “YR” with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “MS” and a signature for “MS” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant “YR” has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 14, 2018.

### 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 landlords and the tenants “RK” and “MK” on November 19, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,500.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on October 01, 2017. The tenant “YR” signed the tenancy agreement on November 21, 2017;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated February 02, 2018, which the landlords state was served to the tenants on February 02, 2018, for \$1,500.00 in unpaid rent due on February 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of February 12, 2018;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$1,500.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent due by February 01, 2018;
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord “AS” served the Notice to the tenants by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on February 02, 2018. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “MS” and a signature for “MS” 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 landlords allege 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 tenants are 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 tenants are deemed to have received the Notice on February 05, 2018, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,500.00, 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 \$1,500.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed by February 01, 2018 for the month of February 2018.

I accept the landlords' 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, February 15, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,500.00 for unpaid rent owing for February 2018, as of February 14, 2018 the date on which the landlords' Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request was submitted.

As the landlords were successful in this application, I find that the landlords are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

### 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.

Pursuant to sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I find that the landlords are entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$1,600.00 for unpaid rent, and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlords are 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 16, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch