



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on February 14, 2012 the landlord served each tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. Section 90 of the Residential Tenancy Act determines that a document is deemed to have been served on the fifth day after it was sent.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenants have 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 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 each tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on November 1, 2011 for a tenancy beginning November 1, 2011 for the monthly rent of \$2000.00 due on 1st of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, January 31, 2012 with an effective vacancy date of February 10, 2012 due to \$3703.35 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay rent totaling \$3703.35 to the end of January 2012 and that the tenants were served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by registered mail that was mailed on January 31, 2012, and therefore is deemed served five 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 tenants have been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlord. The notice is deemed to have been received by the tenant(s) on February 5, 2012 and the effective date of the notice is amended to February 15, 2012 pursuant to section 53 of the *Act*. 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.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is 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.

I dismissed the landlords monetary claim with leave to reapply through the normal dispute resolution process, because although the tenancy agreement states that this tenancy began November 1, 2011, the landlord has included outstanding rent dating back to January 11, 2011 and has provided no explanation of the discrepancy.

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 20, 2012.

Residential Tenancy Branch