



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding NACEL PROPERTIES LTD
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

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 and a monetary order for unpaid rent.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 21, 2014, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding personal service.

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

Issues to be Decided

Is the landlord is entitled to an order of possession?
Is the landlord entitled to a monetary order 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 19, 2013, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,050.00 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 January 2, 2014 with a stated effective vacancy date of January 13, 2014, for \$1,050.00 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 to the door on January 8, 2014, which was witnessed. Section 90 of the Act

deems the tenant was served on January 11, 2014, which would correct the above-mentioned effective date to January 21, 2014.

The Notice states that the tenant had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end from the service date. 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 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 and a monetary Order for unpaid rent.

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.

I find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant to section 67 in the amount of **\$1,050.00** comprised of rent owed.

This Order must be served on the tenant and may be filed in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and enforced as an Order of that Court.

Conclusion

The landlord is entitled to an order of possession.

The landlord is entitled to a monetary order for unpaid rent.

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: January 24, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch

