



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR

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 Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on November 28, 2018, the landlord posted the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The landlord had a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89(2) and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants are deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on December 1, 2018, the third day after their posting.

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*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and Tenant S.L. on May 24, 2014, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,150.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on January 1, 2013;

- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$1,150.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$1,192.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated November 15, 2018, for \$2,368.00 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 November 25, 2018;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 2:30 pm on November 15, 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 November 15, 2018.

Paragraph 12 (1) (b) of the Residential Tenancy Regulation establishes that a tenancy agreement is required to be “signed and dated by both the landlord and the tenant.”

I find that Tenant J.L. has not signed the tenancy agreement, which is a requirement of the direct request process. For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlords’ application naming Tenant J.L. as a respondent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

However, I find that Tenant S.L. was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,192.00, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notice of Rent Increase.

I accept the evidence before me that Tenant S.L. has 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 Tenant S.L. is 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, November 25, 2018.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for October 2018 and November 2018 as of November 28, 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 attaching a copy to a door at the address at which the tenant resides.

Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by attaching a copy to a door at the address at which the tenant resides, only when considering an Order of Possession for the landlord.

I find that the landlord has served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit at which Tenant S.L. resides, and for this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application naming Tenant S.L. as a respondent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on Tenant S.L. Should Tenant S.L. **and any other occupant** fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

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: December 05, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch