



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

DECISION

Dispute Codes:

OPR, MNR, FF

Introduction

This hearing was scheduled in response to the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution, in which the landlord has made application for an Order of Possession for Unpaid Rent, a monetary Order for unpaid rent and to recover the filing fee from the tenant for the cost of this Application for Dispute Resolution.

The landlord provided affirmed testimony that on February 18, 2010, copies of the Application for Dispute Resolution and Notice of Hearing were sent to the tenant via registered mail at the address noted on the Application. A Canada Post tracking number was provided as evidence of service.

These documents are deemed to have been served in accordance with section 89 of the Act; however the tenant did not appear at the hearing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of possession for unpaid rent?

Is the landlord entitled to a monetary Order?

Is the landlord entitled to filing fee costs?

Background and Evidence

The tenancy commenced in November 2008; rent was \$650.00 per month, due on the first day of each month. A deposit in the sum of \$325.00 was paid in November, 2008.

The landlord stated that on February 2, 2011, at 10 a.m., with her spouse present as a witness, she posted a ten (10) day Notice to End Tenancy for non-payment of rent to the door of the rental unit. The Notice had an effective date of February 13, 2011. The

landlord took a photograph of the Notice on the door, but did not submit a copy as evidence.

The Notice indicated that the Notice would be automatically cancelled if the landlord received \$1,650.00 within five days after the tenant is assumed to have received the Notice. The Notice also indicated that the tenant is presumed to have accepted that the tenancy is ending and that the tenant must move out of the rental by the date set out in the Notice unless the tenant filed an Application for Dispute Resolution within five days.

The tenant paid \$460.00 in October, 2010; \$500.00 in November, 2010 and \$500.00 on February 7, 2011. On February 9, 2011, the landlord issued a receipt for use and occupancy only.

Analysis

Section 90 of the Act stipulates that a document that is posted on a door is deemed to be received on the third day after it is posted. I therefore find that the tenant received the Notice to End Tenancy on February 5, 2011.

Section 46(1) of the Act stipulates that a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy is effective ten days after the date that the tenant receives the Notice. As the tenant is deemed to have received this Notice on February 5, 2011, I find that the earliest effective date of the Notice is February 15, 2011.

Section 53 of the Act stipulates that if the effective date stated in a Notice is earlier than the earliest date permitted under the legislation, the effective date is deemed to be the earliest date that complies with the legislation. Therefore, I find that the effective date of this Notice to End Tenancy was February 15, 2011.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I find that the tenant was served with a Notice to End Tenancy that required the tenant to vacate the rental unit on February 15, 2011, pursuant to section 46 of the Act.

Section 46 of the Act stipulates that a tenant has five (5) days from the date of receiving the Notice to End Tenancy to either pay the outstanding rent or to file an Application for Dispute Resolution to dispute the Notice. In the circumstances before me I have no evidence that the tenant exercised either of these rights; therefore, pursuant to section 46(5) of the Act, I find that the tenant accepted that the tenancy has ended. On this basis I will grant the landlord an Order of Possession that is effective 2 days after service to the tenant.

I find that from October 2010 to February, 2011; inclusive, the tenants has paid rent in the amount of \$1,460.00 and that he owed \$3,250.00; resulting in rent arrears in the sum of \$1,790.00. I find that the landlord is entitled to compensation in that amount, as the tenant would be aware that rent is owed on the first day of each month.

I find that the landlord's application has merit and that the landlord is entitled to recover the filing fee from the tenant for the cost of this Application for Dispute Resolution.

Section 72(2) of the Act provides a dispute resolution officer with the ability to deduct any money owed by a tenant to a landlord, from the deposit due to the tenant. Therefore, I find that the landlord may retain the tenant's security deposit plus interest, in the amount of \$325.80, in partial satisfaction of the monetary claim.

Conclusion

The landlord has been granted an Order of Possession that is effective 2 days after service to the tenant. This Order may be served on the tenant, filed with the Supreme Court of British Columbia and enforced as an Order of that Court.

I find that the landlord has established a monetary claim, in the amount of \$1,840.00, which is comprised of unpaid rent from October 2010, to February, 2011, inclusive and \$50.00 in compensation for the filing fee paid by the landlord for this Application for Dispute Resolution.

The landlord will be retaining the tenant's security deposit plus interest, in the amount of \$325.80, in partial satisfaction of the monetary claim.

Based on these determinations I grant the landlord a monetary Order for the balance of \$1,514.20. In the event that the tenant does not comply with this Order, it may be served on the tenant, filed with the Province of British Columbia Small Claims Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

Dated: March 01, 2011.

Residential Tenancy Branch