

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 March 26, 2010 the landlord served each tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by hand.

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 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 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 May 11, 2007 for a tenancy beginning June 1, 2007 for the monthly rent of \$999.00 due on 1st of the month and which shows that a security deposit of \$499.00 was paid on May 11, 2007; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, large 10th 2010 with an effective vacancy date of arch 20th 2010 due to \$266.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay the full rent owed for the month of March 2010 and that the tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was posted on the door of the tenant's rental unit on March 10, 2010 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 landlord. The notice is deemed to have been received by the tenant(s) on March 13, 2010 and the effective date of the notice is amended to March 23, 2010 pursuant to section 53 of the *Act*. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have failed to pay the rent owed in full with in the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act*. A portion of the rent was paid at this time there is still \$31.00 outstanding for the month of March 2010.

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.

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.

I find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant section 67 in the amount of \$81.00 comprised of \$31.00 rent owed and the \$50.00 fee paid by the Landlord(s) for this application. I order that the landlord(s) may therefore retain \$81.00 of the security deposit in satisfaction of the claim.

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 08, 2010.

Dispute Resolution Officer