

DECISION

Dispute Codes

OPR, 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 .

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 26, 2010 the landlord served one of the tenants personally with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding and on April 29, 2010 served the other tenant by posting. Section 90 of the Residential Tenancy Act determines that a document is deemed to have been served on the third day after was posted.

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 and to recover the filing fee from the tenants for the cost of the Application for Dispute Resolution, pursuant to sections 55, 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 1, 2007 for a tenancy beginning May 1, 2007 for the monthly rent of \$700.00 due on 1st of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, April 7, 2010 with an effective vacancy date of April 17, 2010 due to \$700.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay the rent owed for the month of April 2010 and that the tenants were served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by hand on April 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 tenants have been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlord. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 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 further order that the respondent's bear the \$50.00 cost of the filing fee that was paid for this application for dispute resolution

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: May 05, 2010.

Dispute Resolution Officer