



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding EVERTRINITY INVESTMENT LIMITED  
PARTNERSHIP and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **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 June 7, 2019, the landlord posted the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The landlord had 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 sections 89(2) and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on June 10, 2019, 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*?

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 relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenant on February 1, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of

\$500.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on February 1, 2016;

- A copy of a document discussing the transfer of ownership from the former landlord, who is named on the residential tenancy agreement, to the current landlord who is applying for dispute resolution;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 21, 2019, for \$1,350.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenant 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 March 31, 2019;
- 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 tenant at 5:00 pm on March 22, 2019;
- A copy of three receipts for rent paid by the tenant, which the landlord has indicated are “for use and occupancy only”, dated March 22, 2019 for \$400.00, April 17, 2019 for \$100.00, and April 25, 2019 for \$650.00; 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 tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on March 22, 2019.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$500.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant 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 the tenant is conclusively presumed under sections 46(5) and 53(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, April 1, 2019.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of May 31, 2019.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenant 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 the tenant resides, and for this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord's application for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

For the same reason noted above, the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

### Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord 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.

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

I dismiss the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application without 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: June 11, 2019

---

Residential Tenancy Branch