



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR

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 of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 02, 2016, at 5:45 PM, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. 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 has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 02, 2016.

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*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on January 08, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$750.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on February 01, 2016;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet on which the landlord indicates that there is unpaid rent in the amount of \$750.00 owed as of February 20, 2016;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated February 24, 2016, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on February 24, 2016, for

\$750.00 in unpaid rent due on February 20, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 05, 2016; and

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of personal service via hand-delivery at 5:00 PM on February 24, 2016. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "SD" and a signature for "SD" is included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the *Act* which provides that the tenant 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 tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenant 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 tenant was duly served with the Notice on February 24, 2016.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay monthly rent in the amount of \$750.00, as established in the tenancy agreement. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay outstanding rental arrears in the amount of \$750.00, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed as of February 20, 2016. I find that the tenant received the Notice on February 24, 2016. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and find that the tenant 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 tenant is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice, March 05, 2016.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession based on the February 24, 2016 Notice served to the tenant for unpaid rent owing as of February 20, 2016.

Conclusion

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

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: March 03, 2016

