



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding FIRST SERVICE RESIDENTIAL and SIMAY INVESTMENT LTD.
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes

OPR & MNR

Introduction

This matter was conducted by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the Act, and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession and a monetary order due to unpaid rent.

The Direct Request process is a mechanism that allows the Landlord to apply for an expedited decision without a participatory hearing. As a result, the Landlord must follow and submit documentation **exactly** as the *Act* prescribes and there can be no omissions or deficiencies within the written submissions that are left open to interpretation or inference.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 15, 2014 the landlord served the tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by hand.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenants have been served with the Dispute Resolution Direct Request Proceeding documents.

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the tenants on may 29, 2013 and by the landlord on June 05, 2013 for a tenancy beginning June 01, 2013 for the monthly rent of \$1,050.00 due on the 1st of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, may 02, 2014 with an effective vacancy date of May 12, 2014 due to \$1,310.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenants had failed to pay the full rent owed for the month of April, leaving an unpaid balance of \$260.00 and all the rent due of \$1,050.00 for May; and that the tenants were served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was posted on the door of the tenants' rental unit on May 02, 2014 and therefore is deemed served three days.

The Notice 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.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and accept that the tenants have been served with Notice to End Tenancy as declared by the landlord. The Notice is deemed to have been received by the tenants on may 05, 2014 and the effective date of the Notice is amended to May 15, 2014 pursuant to section 53 of the *Act*. I accept the evidence before me that the tenants have 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 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.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession, pursuant to section 55 of the *Act*, effective **two days after service on the tenants**. This Order must be served on the tenants and 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 of the *Act*, in the amount of **\$1,310.00** for rent owed. This Order must be served on the tenants and may be filed in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) 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: May 26, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch

