



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, MNR-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 to obtain an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, to obtain monetary compensation for unpaid rent, and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

This decision is written based on the Application for Dispute Resolution, evidence, and submissions provided by the landlords on November 25, 2021.

The landlords submitted three signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on December 2, 2021, the landlords sent Tenant B.L., Tenant T.M., and Tenant T.G. the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post receipt containing the tracking numbers to confirm these mailings.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on December 2, 2021 and are deemed to have been received by Tenant B.L., Tenant T.M., and Tenant T.G. on December 7, 2021, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

The landlords also submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which declares that on December 2, 2021, the landlords sent Tenant D.K. the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by e-mail. The landlords provided a copy of the outgoing e-mail containing the Direct Request documents as attachments to confirm this service. The landlords have also submitted a copy of an Address for Service form which was signed by one of the landlords and Tenant D.K. indicating Tenant D.K. agreed to use e-mail for service of documents.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with sections 43(2) and 44 of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on December 2, 2021 and are deemed to have been received by Tenant D.K. on December 5, 2021, the third day after their e-mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords, Tenant B.L., and Tenant D.K. on November 30, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$3,000.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2020
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated November 19, 2021, for \$3,000.00 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 November 19, 2021
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was served to the tenants in person at 4:00 pm on November 19, 2021
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy

Analysis

Paragraph 12 (1) (b) of the Residential Tenancy Regulation establishes that a tenancy agreement is required to be “signed and dated by both the landlord and the tenant.” I find that Tenant T.M. and Tenant T.G. have not signed the tenancy agreement, which is a requirement of the direct request process. For this reason, the monetary portion of the landlord’s application naming Tenant T.M. and Tenant T.G. as respondents is dismissed without leave to reapply.

However, I find that Tenant B.L. and Tenant D.K. were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$3,000.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was duly served to Tenant B.L. and Tenant D.K. on November 19, 2021.

I accept the evidence before me that Tenant B.L. and Tenant D.K. 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 Tenant B.L. and Tenant D.K. 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, November 29, 2021.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary award in the amount of \$3,000.00, the amount claimed by the landlords for unpaid rent owing for November 2021.

As the landlords were partially successful in this application, I find that the landlords are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords effective **two days after service of this Order** on Tenant B.L. and/or Tenant D.K. Should Tenant B.L., Tenant D.K., or **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.

Pursuant to sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlords a Monetary Order in the amount of \$3,100.00 for rent owed for November 2021 and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlords are provided with this Order in the above terms and Tenant B.L. and/or Tenant D.K. must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should Tenant B.L. and/or Tenant D.K. 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 portion of the landlord's application for a Monetary Order naming Tenant T.M. and Tenant T.G. as respondents 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: January 11, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch