



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

## DECISION

### Dispute Codes

OPR, MNR

### Introduction

This hearing proceeded by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to sections 55(4) and 74(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Act (Act)*, and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the Landlord for an Order of Possession and a monetary order.

The Landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 19, 2011 an agent for the Landlord served the female Tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The Landlord submitted a copy of a Canada Post receipt, with a tracking number, which corroborates that the Landlord mailed a package to the female Tenant at the rental unit. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served by mail is deemed to have been served on the fifth day after it is mailed, which in these circumstances is April 24, 2011.

The Landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 19, 2011 an agent for the Landlord served the male Tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The Landlord submitted a copy of a Canada Post receipt, with a tracking number, which corroborates that the Landlord mailed a package to the male Tenant at the rental unit. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served by mail is deemed to have been served on the fifth day after it is mailed, which in these circumstances is April 24, 2011.

Based on the written submissions of the Landlord, I find 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 Landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent and to a monetary Order for unpaid rent, pursuant to sections 55 and 67 of the *Act*.

### Background and Evidence

I have reviewed the following evidence that was submitted by the Landlord:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for each Tenant.
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement between the Landlord and the Tenant, which appears to be signed by both Tenants, that indicates that the tenancy began on November 01, 2009 and that the Tenants were required to pay rent of \$975.00 by the first day of each month.
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent that was signed by an agent for the Landlord and dated April 08, 2011, which declares that the Tenants must vacate the rental unit by April 18, 2011 as the Tenants failed to pay rent in the amount of \$975.00 that was due on April 01, 2011. The Notice declares that the tenancy will end unless the Tenants pay the rent or submits an Application for Dispute Resolution seeking to set aside the Notice within five days of receiving the Notice.
- A copy of a signed Proof of Service of the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy in which an agent for the Landlord declared that the agent posted the Notice on the Tenants' door on April 08, 2011, in the presence of another party, who also signed the Proof of Service.

In the Application for Dispute Resolution the Landlord declared that the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent was posted on April 08, 2011 and that the Tenants have not paid rent for April of 2011.

### Analysis

Based on the evidence provided by the Landlord and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I find that the Tenants entered into a tenancy agreement that currently requires the Tenants to pay monthly rent of \$975.00 on the first day of each month.

Based on the evidence provided by the Landlord and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I find that the Tenants had not paid rent for April of 2011 by the time the Landlord filed this Application for Dispute Resolution. I have no evidence to show that the Tenants paid the outstanding rent since the Application for Dispute Resolution was filed and therefore I find that the Tenants owe rent in the amount of \$975.00.

Based on the evidence provided by the Landlord and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I find that a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy was posted at the rental unit on April 08, 2011. 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 April 11, 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 April 11, 2011, I find that the earliest effective date of the Notice was April 21, 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 April 21, 2011.

I have no evidence to show that the Tenants filed an Application for Dispute Resolution seeking to set aside the Notice to End Tenancy or that he has paid the outstanding rent. Pursuant to section 46(5) of the *Act*, I therefore find that the Tenants accepted that the tenancy ended on April 21, 2011. On this basis, I find that the Landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession.

### Conclusion

I find that the Landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective two days after service on the Tenants. This Order may be served on the Tenants, 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 \$975.00, for unpaid rent and I grant the Landlord a monetary Order for this amount. In the event that the Tenants do not comply with this Order, it may be served on the Tenants, filed with the Province of British Columbia Small Claims Court 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: April 26, 2011.

---

Residential Tenancy Branch