

## **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 May 13, 2010 the landlord served each 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 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 November 1, 2008 for a tenancy beginning November 1, 2008 for the monthly rent of \$750.00 due on 1st of the month and which shows that a security deposit of \$375.00 was paid on November 1, 2008;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, May 6, 2010 with an effective vacancy date of May 16, 2010 due to \$575.00 in unpaid rent; and
- Copies of a decision and order from a previous dispute resolution hearing.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay the full rent owed for the month of September 2009 and \$150.00 is still outstanding, and the tenant is also failed to pay \$375.00 of May 2010 rent, and that the tenants were served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was posted on the door of the tenant's rental unit on May 6, 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 May 9, 2010 and the effective date of the notice is amended to May 19, 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 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 find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant section 67 in the amount of \$425.00 comprised of \$375.00 rent owed for May 2010, and the \$50.00 fee paid by the Landlord(s) for this application. I order that the landlord(s) may retain the remaining deposit held of \$175.00 in partial satisfaction of the claim and grant an order for the balance due of \$250.00. 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.

The tenant had originally paid a security deposit of \$375.00, however the landlord already has an order from a previous hearing allowing a deduction of \$200.00 from that security deposit to cover is the \$150.00 rent outstanding from September of 2009, plus the filing fee of \$50.00 paid in that prior hearing; therefore there is only \$175.00 security deposit still held.

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 21, 2010.

---

Dispute Resolution Officer