



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 March 31, 2010 the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail sent to the rental unit address. The landlord provided a Canada Post receipt and tracking number as evidence of service. 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?

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 September 25, 2009, indicating a monthly rent of \$700.00 due on the first day of the month and that a security deposit of \$350.00 and pet deposit in the sum of \$50.00 was paid on October 1, 2009; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on March 22, 2010, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 31, 2010, for \$700.00 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 personal delivery and posting to the door on March 22, 2010. The Notice was posted at 12:30 p.m. and removed by the tenant's minor child, who then signed a Proof of Service document. The Proof of service document and Application indicate that the tenant was personally served at the door of the rental unit by the landlord, on March 22, 2010. The Act deems the tenant was served on the day of personal delivery, March 22, 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 details of the dispute indicate the landlord has claimed compensation for unpaid February and March rent. The amount claimed requesting a monetary Order is for one month's rent. The Notice issued on March 22, 2010, indicates that only \$700.00 is owed, that was due on March 1, 2010.

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 March 22, 2010.

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*.

Section 53 of the Act allows the effective date of a Notice to be changed to the earliest date upon which the Notice complies with the Act; therefore, I find that the Notice effective date is changed to April 1, 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.

Based on the landlord's written submission I find that the landlord is entitled to compensation for unpaid March, 2010, in the sum of \$700.00. I base this decision on the monetary Order amount claimed on the Application and the Notice to End Tenancy issued on March 22, 2010.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of possession, a monetary Order for unpaid March rent, and the application fee cost.

The landlord has not applied to retain the deposits paid by the tenant. Any deposit held in trust by the landlord must be disbursed as required by section 38 of the Act.

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 in the amount of **\$750.00** comprised of \$700.00 March, 2010, rent owed and the \$50.00 fee paid for this application and I grant an Order in that amount. 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.

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: April 12, 2010.

Dispute Resolution Officer