



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Dumac Holding Ltd.
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* 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 landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 21, 2013, the landlord sent both tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Tracking Numbers to confirm these registered mailings.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notices of Direct Proceeding served to the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,500.00 due on the 1st day of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) posted on the tenants' door on March 11, 2013, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 24, 2013, for \$1,500.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenants failed to pay all outstanding rent was served by posting the 10 Day Notice to the tenants' door at 12:01 p.m. on March 11, 2013. In accordance with section 88 and 90 of the *Act*, the tenants were deemed served with this 10 Day Notice on March 14, 2013, three days after its posting.

The Notice states that the tenants had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full 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.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and accept that the tenants have been deemed served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlord.

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 10 Day Notice, March 24, 2013.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order of \$1,500.00 for unpaid rent owing from March 2013.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of the Order** on the tenant(s). Should the tenant(s) fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$1,500.00 for rent owed for March 2013. The landlord is provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant(s) must be served with this Order as soon as possible. Should the tenant(s) fail to comply with these Orders, these Orders may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as Orders 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 02, 2013

