



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 February 12, 2010 the landlord served the 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 tenant has 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 tenant 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 the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on February 26 2001 for a tenancy beginning March 1, 2001 for the monthly rent of \$650.00 due on 1st of the month and which shows that a security deposit of \$325.00 was paid; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, December 28, 2009 with an effective vacancy date of January 7, 2010 due to \$20,055.47 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had outstanding rent totaling \$20,055.47 to the end of December 2009. And that the tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by hand on December 28, 2009.

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 tenant has been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlord. I accept the evidence before me that the



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 3

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Housing and Social Development

tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the Act.

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(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.

However I will not issue any monetary order for the alleged outstanding rent, because the landlord has supplied no evidence to show how he arrived at the figure of \$20,055.47. The monetary portion of this claim is therefore dismissed with leave to reapply.

I will order that the respondent bear \$50.00 of the filing fee that was paid by the landlord, because that is the amount that the landlord would have had to pay for an application for an Order of Possession. The landlord may therefore retain \$50.00 of the security deposit.

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: February 19, 2010.

Dispute Resolution Officer