

DECISION

Dispute Codes

OPR, & MNR

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 landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on October 1, 2010 the landlords served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding 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 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 landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent and to a monetary Order for unpaid rent, pursuant to sections 46, 55, & 67 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 April 11, 2010 for a tenancy beginning April 13, 2010 for the monthly rent of \$650.00 due on 1st of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, September 17, 2010 with an effective vacancy date of September 27, 2010 due to \$2143.13 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay outstanding rent totaling \$2143.13 to the end of September 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 September 17, 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 tenant has been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlords. The notice is deemed to have been received by the tenant(s) on September 20, 2010 and the effective date of the notice is amended to September 30, 2010 pursuant to section 53 of the *Act*. I accept the evidence

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Housing and Social Development

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 landlords are 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.

The applicants did not serve the notice of hearing and hearing package in a method allowed for a monetary claim, and therefore the monetary portion of this claim is dismissed with leave to reapply.

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: October 22, 2010.

Dispute Resolution Officer