

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 *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "Act"), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession, a monetary order and an order to retain the security deposit in partial satisfaction of the claim.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 16, 2010 the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a Canada Post receipt and tracking number as evidence of service to the rental unit address. Section 90 of the Act determines that a document is deemed to have been served on the fifth day after mailing.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenant has been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of possession?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent?

May the landlord retain the deposit paid?

Is the landlord entitled to filing fee costs?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on June 6, 2007, indicating a monthly rent of \$950.00 due on the first day of the month and that a deposit of \$477.50 was paid on June 6, 2007; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on January 6, 2010 with a stated effective vacancy date of January 16, 2010, for \$1,040.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenant has failed to pay rent owed and was served the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by posting on the door on January 6, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. The Act deems the tenant was served on January 9, 2010.

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 from the date of service.

The landlord's Application details indicate that the tenant has failed to pay rent in the sum of \$1,040.00.

<u>Analysis</u>

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 January 9, 2010.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay rent owed in full with in the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act*.

Section 53(2) of the Act provides:

If the effective date stated in the notice is earlier than the earliest date permitted under the applicable section, the effective date is deemed to be the earliest date that complies with the section.

Therefore, the effective date of the Notice is changed to January 19, 2010.

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.

The landlord has not provided any details for rent increases that may have occurred as provided by the Act. In the absence of any financial documents such as a tenant

ledger, I am unable to determine if the rent arrears indicated on the Notice is for a one month period or a combination of months; therefore; the monetary claim is dismissed with leave to reapply so that the landlord may produce evidence of any rent increases and other evidence demonstrating the months for which rent was unpaid.

The landlord is currently holding in trust a deposit plus interest in the sum of \$488.82.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of possession and the application fee cost.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service** on the tenant and the Order 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 comprised of the \$50.00 fee paid for this application.

I order that the landlord may retain \$50.00 from the deposit and interest held and will disburse the balance of \$438.82 as provided by section 38 of the Act.

The monetary claim is dismissed 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: January 22, 2010.

Dispute Resolution Officer