



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Singla Bros. Holdings Ltd  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR-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.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 23, 2020, the landlord personally served Tenant G.S. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(1) of the *Act*, I find that Tenant G.S. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 23, 2020.

The landlord submitted a second signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 23, 2020, the landlord served Tenant C.H. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by handing the documents to Tenant G.S. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(2) of the *Act*, I find that Tenant C.H. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 23, 2020.

### 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 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 March 6, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,730.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on March 6, 2020;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated September 3, 2020, for \$1,730.00 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 September 13, 2020;
- 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 at 3:00 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on September 6, 2020; 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 I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,730.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on September 6, 2020, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 tenants are 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, September 16, 2020.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of the date of this application, September 15, 2020.

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.

However, 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 leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant. Section 89(2) of the *Act* does allow for the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to be given to the tenant by leaving a copy with an adult who resides with the tenant, only when considering an Order of Possession for the landlord.

I find that the landlord has served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to Tenant C.H. by leaving a copy with Tenant G.S., an adult who resides with Tenant C.H. For this reason, I find the landlord is only entitled to a Monetary Order for the return of the filing fee against Tenant G.S., the tenant who was served in accordance with section 89(1) of the *Act*.

### 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 section 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlord a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant G.S. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant G.S. 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.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for the return of the filing fee naming Tenant C.H. as a respondent 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: October 05, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch