

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR MNR MNSD FF

Introduction

This hearing proceeded by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 74(2)(b) of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the Act).

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 the security and pet deposits; and to recover the filing fee from the Tenant for the cost of the Application for Dispute Resolution, pursuant to Sections 38, 55, 67, and 72 of the Act. I have reviewed all documentary evidence submitted by the Landlord.

Background and Evidence

The Landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the Tenant on April 9, 2008, along with a ledger of rent payments made by the Tenant. The tenancy agreement indicates a monthly rent of \$1,300.00 due on the first of each month. However, the ledger indicates that the Tenant was awarded a rent rebate for garden services provided. The tenancy agreement is a 1 year lease, commencing on May 1, 2008 and ending April 30, 2009. The tenancy agreement states that a security deposit in the amount of \$650.00 was paid on April 9, 2008, and a pet deposit of \$500.00 was paid on May 23, 2008.
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on September 4, 2009, with an effective vacancy date of September 14, 2009 for \$1,200.00 in unpaid rent.

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities;
- A copy of the Landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution, filed September 16, 2009; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for each Tenant.

The Landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 16, 2009, the Landlord's agent served the Tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, by registered mail, to the rental unit. The Landlord provided a copy of the registered mail receipt and tracking number.

The Landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy which declares that on September 4, 2009, at 2:00 p.m., the Landlord's agent served the Tenant with the Notice to End Tenancy by posting it on the Tenant's door at the rental unit. The Proof of Service document was signed by a Witness.

Analysis

Sections 88 and 89 of the Act determine the method of service for documents. The Landlord has applied for a monetary Order which requires that the Landlord serve each Respondent as set out under Section 89(1). I am satisfied that the Tenant was served with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents, by registered mail. Service in this manner is deemed to be effected 5 days after mailing. Therefore, the Tenant is deemed to have received the documents on September 21, 2009.

Documentary evidence filed by the Landlord indicates that the Tenants were served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by posting it on the Tenant's door on September 4, 2009. Service in this manner is deemed to have been effected 3 days after posting the Notice. Therefore, the Notice is deemed to have been served on

September 7, 2009. The Tenant did not pay the rental arrears, or apply to dispute the Notice to End Tenancy within five days of being served with the Notice. The Notice states that the Tenants had five days to pay the rent or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end. In this case, the effective end of Tenancy is September 17, 2009.

The tenancy agreement indicates that the Tenant must move out on April 30, 2009. However, the ledger confirms that the Tenant remained in the rental unit on a month-to-month basis and paid a reduced rent. At the date of the issuance of the Notice to End Tenancy, monthly rent was \$1,200.00.

Based on the written submissions of the Landlord, I find that the Tenant has been duly served with the Dispute Resolution Direct Request Proceeding documents for the purposes of an application under Section 55 for an Order of Possession and Section 67 for a Monetary Order.

Order of Possession - Further to Section 46(5) of the Act, I find that the Tenant was conclusively presumed to have accepted that the tenancy ended on September 17, 2009, 10 days after service was affected. The Landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession and I make that Order.

Monetary Order – I find that the Landlord is entitled to a monetary claim against the Tenant and that this claim meets the criteria under section 72(2)(b) of the *Act* to be offset against the Tenant's security and pet deposits. The Landlord has been successful in its Application and is entitled to recover the filing fee from the Tenant. The Landlord has established a Monetary Order, as follows:

Unpaid Rent for September, 2009	\$1,200.00
Filing fee	50.00
Sub total (Monetary Order in favor of the landlord)	\$1,250.00
Less Security Deposit and accrued interest of \$7.11	-\$657.11
Less Pet Deposit and accrued interest of \$4.59	-\$504.59
TOTAL OFF-SET AMOUNT DUE TO THE LANDLORD	\$88.30

Conclusion

I HEREBY 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 of British Columbia and enforced as an order of that Court.

I HEREBY FIND in favor of the Landlord's monetary claim in the amount of \$88.30 against the Tenant. The monetary Order must be served on the Tenant and is enforceable through the Provincial Court of British Columbia (Small Claims) and enforced as an order 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: September 28, 2009.
