



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding C.Q. Enterprises Ltd.
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR

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 landlord for an Order of Possession. The landlord did not request a Monetary Order.

The landlord 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 in person on May 17, 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 issue to be decided is whether the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for 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 28, 2011 at a monthly rent of \$850 with a security deposit of \$425 paid on November 1, 2011. It is not clear on the agreement whether a pet damage deposit has also been paid;

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for unpaid rent which was served in person on May 4, 2013;

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates the tenants had failed to pay \$750 of the rent that was due on May 1, 2013.

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.

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 May 14, 2013.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession based on the Notice to End Tenancy of May 4, 2013.

Conclusion

The landlord's 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.

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: June 05, 2013

Residential Tenancy Branch

