



# 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 March 07, 2018, the landlord 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 forms establish that the service was witnessed by “DG” and a signature for “DG” is included on the forms.

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 March 12, 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 November 06, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,400.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 01, 2016;
- A copy of a "Notice of Rent Increase" form provided to the tenants during the course of the tenancy, which depicts that the monthly rent was increased to the current amount of \$1,451.80;
- Copies of bank statements which, as the landlord asserts, depict that for each of February 2018 and March 2018, a sum of \$1,451.80 was deposited to the landlord's account by the tenant "TC", and subsequently withdrawn from the account due to "returned credit clearing";
- 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 \$1,451.80 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent due by February 01, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated February 20, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on February 20, 2018, for \$1,451.80 in unpaid rent due on February 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 01, 2018;
- 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 8:00 PM on February 20, 2018. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "DG" and a signature for "DG" 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 landlord. 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 23, 2018, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,451.80, and accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$1,451.80, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed by February 01, 2018 for the month of February 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 corrected effective date of the Notice, March 05, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,451.80 for unpaid rent owing for February 2018, as of March 02, 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 \$1,551.80 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: March 13, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch