



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes

OPR, MNR

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 14, 2015, at 10:10 PM, the landlord's agent "JH" served the tenant "SF" with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant "SF" 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 the landlord "JH" and a signature for the landlord is included on the form.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on July 14, 2015, at 10:10 PM, the landlord's agent "JH" served the tenants "KH" and "NC" with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents by leaving the documents at the tenants' residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant. The landlord states that the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents for the tenants "KH" and "NC" were served at the rental unit, by way of hand-delivery, to their co-tenant "SF". The service was confirmed as the co-tenant "SF" acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents by signing the respective Proof of Service forms. The Proof of Service forms also establishes that the service was witnessed by the landlord "JH" and a signature for the landlord is included on the forms.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 14, 2015.

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*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- Three copies of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on March 26, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,000.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on April 1, 2015;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$2,170.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing for the period of April 2015 to July 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated July 3, 2015, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on July 3, 2015, for \$2,170.00 in unpaid rent due on July 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 13, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "JH" served the Notice to the tenants by way of personal service via hand-delivery to the tenant "KH" on July 3, 2015. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by the landlord "JH" and a signature for the landlord is 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 and find that in accordance with section 88 of the *Act* the tenants were duly served with the Notice on July 3, 2015.

Direct Request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability of the tenants to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied.

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 reads, in part, as follows:

Special rules for certain documents

89 (1) An application for dispute resolution or a decision of the director to proceed with a review under Division 2 of Part 5, when required to be given to one party by another, must be given in one of the following ways:

- (a) by leaving a copy with the person;
- (b) if the person is a landlord, by leaving a copy with an agent of the landlord;
- (c) by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, to the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;
- (d) if the person is a tenant, by sending a copy by registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant;

(2) An application by a landlord under section 55 [*order of possession for the landlord*], 56 [*application for order ending tenancy early*] or 56.1 [*order of possession: tenancy frustrated*] must be given to the tenant in one of the following ways:

- (a) by leaving a copy with the tenant;
- (b) by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the tenant resides;
- (c) by leaving a copy at the tenant's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant;
- (d) by attaching a copy to a door or other conspicuous place 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 left at the tenant's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant only when considering the issuance of an Order of Possession for the landlord. The landlord served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents to the tenants "NC" and "KH" in this fashion, by leaving the documents with their co-tenant "SF". As the landlord served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenants "NC" and "KH" in accordance with section 89(2)(c) of the *Act*, I have leave to hear only that part of the landlord's application against the tenants "NC" and "KH" that asks for an Order of Possession. I do not have leave to hear the landlord's application against the tenants "NC" and "KH" for a monetary Order. Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application against the tenants "NC" and "KH" for a monetary Order with leave to reapply. I will consider the landlord's application for both an Order of Possession and a monetary Order against the tenant "SF".

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$1,000.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay outstanding rental arrears in the amount of \$2,170.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owing for the period of April 2015 to July 2015. I find that the tenants received the Notice on July 3, 2015. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenants did not pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not apply to dispute the Notice within that 5-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, July 13, 2015.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$2,170.00 for unpaid rent owing for the period of April 2015 to July 2015.

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 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$2,170.00 for unpaid rent owing for the period of April 2015 to July 2015. 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: July 15, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

