



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding PORTE REALTY 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 *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 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 June 16, 2014 the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by hand.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenant has 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 tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on November 18, 2013 for a tenancy beginning December 01, 2013 for the monthly rent of \$800.00 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, June 03, 2014 with an effective vacancy date of June 13, 2014 due to \$825.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenant had failed to pay the full rent owed for the month of June and that the tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by hand on June 03, 2014.

The Notice 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.

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. The Notice is deemed to have been received by the tenant on June 03, 2014. 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*. However, the rent for June was \$800.00 and the landlord has included a late fee of \$25.00 on the 10 day Notice. The landlord is only entitled to file an application to recover unpaid rent under a Direct Request Proceeding. Consequently I have limited the landlords claim to \$800.00.

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.

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 tenant**. This Order must be served on the tenant 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 **\$800.00** for 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.

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 23, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch

