



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Wall Financial Corporation
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR and MNR

Introduction

This hearing was conducted as a 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 landlords for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that the landlord served the tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding sent by registered mail on March 20, 2013.

Based on the written submission of the landlord, I find that the tenants have been 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 a Monetary Order for the unpaid rent.

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 October 31, 2012 at a monthly rent of \$920 and indicating a security deposit of \$460 was paid at the beginning of the tenancy;

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for unpaid rent which was served by posting on the tenants' door on March 2, 2013.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that, on March 5, 20013, the tenants paid only \$465 of the rent due on March 1, 2013. The claim also includes a previous rent shortfall of \$70 and two previous late fees. As late fees cannot be awarded in a direct request proceeding, I have reduced the landlord's claim by \$40, to \$525 based on \$920 rent plus previous shortfall of \$70 equals \$990 less \$465 equals \$525 owed.

The Notice to End Tenancy states that the tenants had five days to pay the rent 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.

The landlord had requested a monetary claim in this application for the unpaid rent of \$565 which, as noted, I have reduced of \$525.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and accept that the tenants were served with Notice to End Tenancy as declared by the landlord.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenants failed to pay the rent owed in full within the five 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 which was March 15, 2013 taking into account three days for deemed service of notice service by posting..

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession based on the Notice to End Tenancy of March 2, 2013.

I further find that the landlord is entitled to a Monetary Order for the unpaid rent as noted.

Conclusion

The landlords' copy of this Decision is accompanied by an Order of Possession effective **two days after service** on the tenants. The Order may be filed in the Supreme Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

The landlord is also provided with a Monetary Order for \$525 for the unpaid rent for service on the tenants. This Order is enforceable through the Provincial 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: March 28, 2013

Residential Tenancy Branch

