



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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 11, 2018, the landlord served Tenant A.D. by leaving the Notice with Tenant J.B., an adult who resides with Tenant A.D. The landlord had Tenant J.B. and a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(2) of the *Act*, I find that Tenant A.D. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 26, 2018.

The landlord has not provided a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for Tenant J.B. and has not established that Tenant J.B. has been served their own copy of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding as required under section 89 of the *Act*.

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:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on March 21, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,800.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on March 01, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated May 02, 2018, for \$1,800.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides 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 on the stated effective vacancy date of May 13, 2018;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally handed to Tenant J.B. on May 03, 2018; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were duly served with the 10 Day Notice on May 02, 2018.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,800.00 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 effective date of the 10 Day Notice, May 13, 2018.

In this type of matter, the landlord 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 leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant.

Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant, only when considering an Order of Possession for the landlord.

I find that the landlord has served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to Tenant A.D. by leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the Tenant A.D., and for this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application concerning unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

For the same reason listed above, the monetary portion of the landlord's application to recover the filing fee for this application is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for May 2018 as of May 10, 2018.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. 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.

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: May 14, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch