



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding VANCOUVER RESOURCE SOCIETY
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of 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.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on July 26, 2013, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. A Canada post tracking number was provided as evidence.

Section 90 of the Act determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been served five days later.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenant has 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?

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 *, indicating a monthly rent of \$ due on the first day of the month; and

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on July 5, 2013, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 22, 2013, for \$835.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenant had failed to pay all rent owed and was served the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by, posting on the door and witnessed on July 5, 2013. Section 90 of the Act deems the tenant was served on July 8, 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 landlord.

I note, while the notice to end tenancy states the rent owed is for June 2013. However, the application filed indicated the rent owed was for July 2013. Therefore, as the tenant should have known the notice was issued as a result of failing to rent for July, 2013, I find it is appropriate to amend the notice pursuant to section 68 of the Act.

The landlord writes in their application, "tenant refused to pay July rent. States landlord failed to deal with mice infestation."
[Reproduces as written]

However, section 26 of the Act states a tenant must pay rent when due under the tenancy agreement, whether or not the landlord complies with the Act, unless the tenant has the right under this act to deduct or a portion of rent, such as an order granted by an arbitrator.

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 effective date of the Notice. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of possession for unpaid rent.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service** on the tenant and this 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: August 01, 2013

Residential Tenancy Branch

