



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

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 Landlords for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent.

The Landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 25, 2011 the Landlords served the Tenant in person with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. Based on the evidence and written submissions of the Landlords, I find that the Tenant was served as required by s. 89 of the Act 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 and 67 of the *Residential Tenancy Act (Act)*.

Background and Evidence

The Landlords submitted the following documentary evidence:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for the Tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on October 22, 2010 for a month-to-month tenancy beginning November 1, 2010 for the monthly rent of \$650.00 due in advance on the 1st day of each month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on January 11, 2011 with an effective vacancy date of January 16, 2011 due to \$650.00 in unpaid rent.

The evidence filed by the Landlords indicates that the Tenant had rent arrears of \$325.00 for the month of January, 2011 and that the Tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities on January 11, 2011 when it was posted to the rental unit door. The Notice states that the Tenant had five days to pay

the rent or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end. The Tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice to End Tenancy within five days.

Analysis

I have reviewed all of the documentary evidence and accept that the Tenant been served with the Notice to End Tenancy as declared by the Landlords. The Notice was served by posting it on January 11, 2011, and is therefore is deemed pursuant to s. 90 of the Act to be received by the Tenant 3 days later. Consequently, the effective date of the Notice is amended to January 24, 2011 pursuant to s. 53 of the Act. I accept the evidence before me that the Tenant has failed to pay the full rent owed 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 pursuant to s. 55(2)(b) of the Act that the Landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service on the Tenant**. This Order must be served on the Tenant and may be filed in the Supreme Court of British Columbia and enforced as an Order of that Court. I also find that the Landlords are entitled to a Monetary Order for the unpaid rent in the amount of **\$325.00**. This Order must be served on the Tenant and may be enforced in the Provincial (Small Claims) Court of British Columbia.

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: February 02, 2011.

Residential Tenancy Branch