



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 landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on November 4, 2009 the landlords served each tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. Section 90 of the Residential Tenancy Act determines that a document is deemed to have been served on the fifth day after it was sent.

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 landlords are 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:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for each tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on June 16, 2009 for a tenancy beginning July 1, 2009 for the monthly rent of \$915.00 due on 1st of the month and which shows that a security deposit of \$450.00 was paid on June 16, 2009; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, October 2, 2009 with an effective vacancy date of October 16, 2009 due to \$2850.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay the rent owed for the August 2009, September 2009, and October 2009 and that the tenants were served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was posted on the door of the tenant's rental unit on October 2, 2009 and therefore is deemed served three days later.

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

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and accept that the tenants have been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlords. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay the rent owed within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act*.

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.



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 3

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Housing and Social Development

Conclusion

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

I find that the landlords are entitled to monetary compensation pursuant section 67 in the amount of \$2795.00, comprised of \$2745.00 rent owed, and the \$50.00 fee paid by the Landlord(s) for this application. I order that the landlord(s) may retain the deposit and interest held of \$450.00 in partial satisfaction of the claim and grant an order for the balance due of \$2345.00. This order must be served on the tenant(s) and may be filed in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and enforced as an order of that Court.

The applicants had requested a monetary order of \$2850.00 however the application states that three months rent is outstanding, and as rent is \$915.00 per month the total comes to \$2745.00. Since there is no explanation as to what the extra \$105.00 relates to, I dismissed that portion of the claim 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: November 10, 2009.

Dispute Resolution Officer