



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Royal LePage Property Management
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 specify a request for a Monetary Order on the application.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding in person on June 25, 2013.

Based on the written submission of the landlord, I find that the tenant has 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 tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on January 4, 2013 at a monthly rent of \$600 with a security deposit of \$300;

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for unpaid rent which was served by posting on the tenant's door on June 4, 2013.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates the tenant had failed to pay the \$600 rent that was due on June 1, 2013.

The Notice to End Tenancy states that the tenant had five days to pay the rent 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 was served with Notice to End Tenancy as declared by the landlord.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant 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 tenant is 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 June 17, 2013 taking into account the three days for deemed service of notice served by posting.

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

Conclusion

The landlord's copy of this Decision is accompanied by an Order of Possession effective **two days after service** on the tenant. 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: July 05, 2013

Residential Tenancy Branch

