



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 July 17, 2019, the landlord served Tenant P.N. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by posting the documents 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 Tenant P.N. is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 20, 2019, the third day after their posting.

The landlord has not submitted a copy of a Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to establish service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents to Tenant N.B. For this reason, I will only proceed with the portion of the landlord's application naming Tenant P.N. as a respondent.

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

I have reviewed all written submissions and evidence before me; however, only the evidence and submissions relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

The landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on May 15, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,200.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 2, 2019, for \$1,200.00 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 July 11, 2019;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door on July 2, 2019; 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 sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that Tenant P.N. was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on July 5, 2019, three days after its posting.

I find that Tenant P.N. was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,200.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that Tenant P.N. 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 P.N. 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, July 15, 2019.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of July 16, 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 Tenant P.N. 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 Tenant P.N. Should Tenant P.N. **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.

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: July 22, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch