



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-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.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on November 16, 2018, the landlords served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The Proof of Service form also states that the service was witnessed by “L.R.” and a signature for “L.R.” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords, and in accordance with sections 89 of the Act, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on November 16, 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 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 on July 30, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,000.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on August 1, 2018;

- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlords set out their basis for a monetary claim in the amount of \$1,000.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent due by November 1, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the "Notice") dated November 3, 2018, which the landlords state was served to the tenant on November 3, 2018, for \$1,000.00 in unpaid rent due on November 1, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of November 15, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on November 3, 2018. The Proof of Service form states that the service of the Notice was witnessed and a name and signature for the witness are included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the Act which provides that the tenant 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 tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlords alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlords. Section 90 of the Act provides that because the Notice was served by way of posting a copy on the door of the tenant's residence, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice three days after it was posted on the tenant's door. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the Act, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on November 6, 2018, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,000.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$1,000.00, comprised of the unpaid rent owed from November 2018.

I accept the landlords' undisputed evidence and find that the tenant 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 tenant is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the Act to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the Notice, November 16, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession based on the November 03, 2018 Notice served to the tenant for unpaid rent owed by November 01, 2018, as claimed on the landlords' Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request.

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. Should the tenant 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 section 72 of the Act, I find that the landlords are entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlords are provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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: November 26, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch