



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Ministry of Housing and Social Development

## **DECISION**

### Dispute Codes

OPR, MNR, MNSD, FF

### Introduction

This matter was conducted by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the Act, and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession and a monetary order due to unpaid rent.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 11, 2009 the landlord served each tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by hand and by registered mail.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenants have been served with the Dispute Resolution Direct Request Proceeding documents.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

The issues to be decided are whether the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent; to a monetary Order for unpaid rent; to keep all or part of the security deposit; and to recover the filing fee from the tenants for the cost of the Application for Dispute Resolution, pursuant to sections 38, 46, 55, 67, and 72 of the *Residential Tenancy Act (Act)*.

### Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Ministry of Housing and Social Development

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for each tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on May 1, 2009 for a tenancy beginning May 1, 2009 for the monthly rent of \$1250.00 due on 1st of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, September 9, 2009 with an effective vacancy date of September 19, 2009 due to \$1010.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenant had failed to pay the rent owed for the month of September 2009 and that the tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was posted on the door of the tenant's rental unit on September 9, 2009 and therefore is deemed served three days later.

The Notice states that the tenant had five days to pay the rent or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice to End Tenancy within five days.

## Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and accept that the tenant has been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlord. The notice is deemed to have been received by the tenant on September 12, 2009 and the effective date of the notice is amended to September 22, 2009 pursuant to section 53 of the *Act*. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act*.

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Ministry of Housing and Social Development

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.

## Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service on the tenant**. This order must be served on the tenant and may be filed in the Supreme Court and enforced as an order of that Court.

I find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant section 67 in the amount of **\$1060.00** comprised of \$1010.00 rent owed and the \$50.00 fee paid by the Landlord for this application. This order must be served on the tenant and may be filed in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and enforced as an order of that Court.

The applicant had also requested an order allowing him to keep the security deposit plus interest towards his claim however there is no security deposit listed on the tenancy agreement. I therefore make an order regarding the security deposit.

Section 72 of the Residential Tenancy Act reads as follows:

**72** (1) The director may order payment or repayment of a fee under section 59 (2) (c) [*starting proceedings*] or 79 (3) (b) [*application for review of director's decision*] by one party to a dispute resolution proceeding to another party or to the director.

(2) If the director orders a party to a dispute resolution proceeding to pay any amount to the other, including an amount under subsection (1), the amount may be deducted

(a) in the case of payment from a landlord to a tenant, from any rent due to the landlord, and



## Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 4

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Ministry of Housing and Social Development

**(b) in the case of payment from a tenant to a landlord, from any security deposit or pet damage deposit due to the tenant.**

Therefore once the landlord has my monetary order it may be deducted from the security deposit plus interest.

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: September 23, 2009.

---

Dispute Resolution Officer