



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR, ET

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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and an early end to tenancy, and a monetary Order.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 9, 2013, one of the landlords (CR) handed the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. Based on the written submissions of the landlords, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent or for an early end to tenancy pursuant to sections 46, 55 or 56 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords and the tenant(s), indicating a monthly rent of \$700.00 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) handed to the tenant by Landlord CR on May 2, 2013, with a stated effective vacancy date of May 2, 2013, for \$700.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlords indicates that the tenant failed to pay all outstanding rent was served by handing the tenant the 10 Day Notice on May

2, 2013. In accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, the tenant was served with this 10 Day Notice on May 2, 2013.

The Notice states that the tenant 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 tenant 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 tenant has been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlords. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has 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 tenant is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, May 12, 2013.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent and a monetary Order of \$700.00 for unpaid rent owing from May 2013.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. 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. As the landlords have been granted an Order of Possession for unpaid rent there is no need to consider the landlords' application for an Order of Possession for an early end to tenancy.

Pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*, I find that the landlords are entitled to a monetary Order in the amount of \$700.00 for rent owed for May 2013. The landlords are provided with these Orders in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant 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: May 13, 2013

