



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "Act"), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 20, 2011, the landlord served the tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail.

Section 90 of the Act determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been served five days later.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the 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 a monetary Order for unpaid rent, pursuant to sections 46, 55 and 67 of the Act.

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on April 27, 2009, indicating a monthly rent of \$975.00 due on the first day of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on January 4, 2011, with a stated effective vacancy date of January 14, for \$1,025.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenants had failed to pay all rent owed and were served the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by personal delivery, which was witnessed on January 4, 2011.

The Notice states that the tenants had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end. The tenants did not apply to dispute the Notice to End Tenancy within five days from the date of service.

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. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of possession and a monetary Order for unpaid rent.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service** on the tenants and the Order may be filed in the Supreme Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

I note the landlord did not provide sufficient evidence that the rent had been increased in accordance with the *Act*. Therefore, I find that the landlord is only entitled to rent in the amount of the tenancy agreement of \$975.00 per month.

I find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant section 67 in the amount of **\$975.00** comprised of rent owed.

This Order must be served on the tenants and may be filed in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and enforced as an Order of that Court.

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: January 26, 2011.

Residential Tenancy Branch