



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Supermen Property Management INC.  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

### Dispute Codes

OPR – DR    OPUM – DR

### Introduction

This application has been made via the Direct Request Proceeding; an ex parte process pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the *Act*.)

The landlord has applied requesting an order of possession and monetary order based on unpaid rent.

The landlord submitted a proof of service document which declares that on September 25, 2019 the landlord served the tenant notice of the direct request proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit address. The landlord provided a copy of a Canada Post receipt and tracking number as confirmation of service to the tenant.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord I find that the tenant has been served the proceeding documents in accordance with section 89(2(b) of the Act.

In accordance with section 90(a) of the Act I find that the tenant is deemed served with notice of the direct request proceeding effective the fifth day after mailing; September 30, 2019.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an order of possession based on unpaid rent?

Is the landlord entitled to a monetary order based on unpaid rent?

### Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following documents:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on March 03, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$725.00, due on the

first day of each month. I note that the tenancy agreement includes clauses that appear to conflict with the Act;

- A copy of a 10 day Notice to end tenancy for unpaid rent or utilities (the Notice) issued on September 02, 2019 with an effective date of September 12, 2019. The Notice indicated that the Notice would be automatically cancelled if the landlord received \$2,484.00 within five (5) days after the tenant was assumed to have received the Notice. The Notice also indicated that the tenant was presumed to have accepted that the tenancy was ending and that the tenant must move out of the rental unit by the date set out in the Notice unless the tenant filed an application for dispute resolution within five (5) days;
- A copy of a proof of service form signed by witness A.L. and landlord E.L.J. declaring that the Notice was served to the tenant by posting to the door on September 02, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. A photograph of the Notice posted to the door was supplied as evidence; and
- A direct request worksheet indicating that effective September 01, 2019 rent in the sum of \$2,484.00 was unpaid. The worksheet supplies no monthly breakdown of the rent owed and paid, in support of the sum indicated as unpaid.

### Analysis

Based on the evidence before me I find that the tenant owes rent in the sum of \$725.00 per month, to be paid on the first day of each month.

Based on the written submission of the landlord I find, pursuant to section 88(g) that the Notice was served to the tenant by posting to the door of the rental unit on September 02, 2019.

Section 90(c) of the Act stipulates that a document that is posted on a door is deemed to be received on the third day after it is posted. Therefore, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice to end tenancy on September 05, 2019.

Section 46(1) of the Act stipulates that a 10 day Notice ending tenancy for unpaid rent and utilities is effective 10 days after the date that the tenant receives the Notice. As the tenant is deemed to have received this Notice on September 05, 2019, I find that the earliest effective date of the Notice is September 15, 2019.

Section 53 of the Act stipulates that if the effective date stated in a Notice is earlier than the earliest date permitted under the legislation, the effective date is deemed to be the earliest date that complies with the legislation. Therefore, I find that the effective date of this Notice to end tenancy was September 15, 2019.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I find that the tenant was served with a Notice ending tenancy that required the tenant to vacate the rental unit on the effective date of the Notice; September 15, 2019.

Section 46(4) of the Act stipulates that a tenant has five (5) days from the date of receiving the Notice ending tenancy to either pay any outstanding rent or to file an application for dispute resolution to dispute the Notice. In the circumstances before me I have no evidence that the tenant exercised either of these rights.

Section 46(5) of the Act provides:

*(5) If a tenant who has received a notice under this section does not pay the rent or make an application for dispute resolution in accordance with subsection (4), the tenant*

*(a) is conclusively presumed to have accepted that the tenancy ends on the effective date of the notice, and*

*(b) must vacate the rental unit to which the notice relates by that date.*

Therefore, pursuant to section 46(5) of the Act, as there is no evidence the rent was paid in full or that the tenant disputed the Notice, I find that the tenant accepted that the tenancy has ended on the effective date of the Notice; September 15, 2019.

Pursuant to section 55(4)(a) of the Act I find that the landlord is entitled to an order of possession. The order is effective **two days after service** to 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.

As the landlord has not provided a breakdown of the sum of rent owed I find that the monetary claim is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Pursuant to section 72(1) of the Act I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee from the tenant.

The landlord is issued a monetary order in the sum of \$100.00 which must be served to the tenant. Should the tenant fail to comply with this order, this order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an order of that Court.

Conclusion

The landlord is entitled to an order of possession based on unpaid rent.

The claim for compensation is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The landlord is entitled to filing fee costs.

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 09, 2019

---

Residential Tenancy Branch