

CORRECTED 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 23, 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 August 8, 2009 with monthly rent of \$1100.00 due on 1st of the month and which shows that a security deposit of \$550.00 was paid on August 8, 2009 (the tenancy agreement states that the tenancy begins on September 1, 2110; however this is an obvious error and I find that the tenancy began on September 1, 2009); and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, May 7, 2010 with an effective vacancy date of May 17, 2010 due to \$1700.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay outstanding rent totaling \$1700.00 to the end of March 2010, and that the tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by hand on March 7, 2010.

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 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.

I find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant section 67 in the amount of \$1750.00 comprised of \$1700.00 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 \$550.00 in partial satisfaction of the claim and grant an order for the balance due of \$1200.00. 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.

This decision corrects and replaces the decision issued on April 8, 2010 in which I inadvertently overlooked a piece of crucial evidence that had been supplied by the applicant.

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 15, 2010.

Dispute Resolution Officer