



# 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 two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceedings which declares that on June 30, 2016, the landlord sent the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding, by way of UPS, to the tenants and have provided shipping orders containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings.

The definition of registered mail is set out in section 1 of the *Act* as “any method of mail delivery provided by Canada Post for which confirmation of delivery to a named person is available.” Section 71 of the *Act* enables me to make an order:

(b) that a document has been sufficiently served for the purposes of this *Act* on a date the director specifies;

(c) that a document not served in accordance with section 88 or 89 is sufficiently given or served for purposes of this *Act*.

I find that the method of service chosen by the landlord requires a signature upon delivery and is comparable with the registered mail delivery provided by Canada Post. For this reason, based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 71 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on July 05, 2016, the fifth day after their shipping via UPS.

### 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:

- Two copies of the Proof of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord on July 28, 2015, and the tenants on July 24, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,650.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on August 01, 2015;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated June 21, 2016, and personally handed to Tenant D.D. on June 21, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of June 30, 2016, for \$1,650.00 in unpaid rent and \$200.00 in unpaid utilities.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally handed to Tenant D.D. at 2:30 p.m. on June 21, 2016. The 10 Day Notice states 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.

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants were duly served with the 10 Day Notice on June 21, 2016.

I find that the tenants were obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,650.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day 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 corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, July 01, 2016.

Section 46 (6) of the *Act* allows the landlord to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent, 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for them. I find that the date of the demand letter is less than 30 days from the time that the 10 Day Notice was issued to the tenants and that not enough time has passed to allow the landlord to treat the unpaid utilities as unpaid rent.

For the above reason the monetary portion of the landlord's application concerning unpaid utilities is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order in the amount of \$1,650.00, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for June 2016 as of June 29, 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.

Pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$1,650.00 for rent owed for June 2016. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenants must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenants 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 monetary portion of the landlord's application concerning unpaid utilities, with 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: July 06, 2016

---

Residential Tenancy Branch