



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 landlords (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 September 20, 2019, the landlord served the tenant “AK” with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant AK acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by signing the Proof of Service form. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “SD” and a signature for “SD” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant AK has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 20, 2019.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which declares that on September 20, 2019, the landlord served the tenant “BF” with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents by leaving the documents at the tenant’s residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant. The landlord states that the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents were served at the rental unit, by way of hand-delivery, to an adult individual bearing the initials “AK”. The service was confirmed as the co-tenant “AK” acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents by signing the Proof of Service form. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “SD” and a signature for “SD” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant BF has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 20, 2019.

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.

On the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, the landlord seeks an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent in the amount of \$1,600.00.

The landlord submitted, in part, the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords and the tenants on July 02, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,600.00 due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 15, 2019;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes that there is unpaid rent owed in the amount of \$1,600.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent due by September 01, 2019;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated September 09, 2019, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on September 09, 2019, for \$1,600.00 in unpaid rent due on September 01, 2019, with a stated effective vacancy date of September 20, 2019;
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenants by way of personal service via hand-delivery to the tenants on September 09, 2019. The Proof of Service form establishes 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 tenants 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 tenants did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenants did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord and find that in accordance with section 88 of the *Act* the tenants were duly served with the Notice on September 09, 2019.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,600.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay rental arrears in the amount of \$1,600.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed by September 01, 2019.

I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenants 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 tenants are conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice, September 20, 2019.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,600.00 for unpaid rent owed by September 01, 2019, as claimed on the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request.

As the landlord was successful in this application, I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

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

Pursuant to sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$1,700.00 for unpaid rent, and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlord is provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant(s) must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) 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: October 02, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch