



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Westwood Ridge Development Corporation
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 landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 20, 2014 the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. Section 90 of the Residential Tenancy Act determines that a document is deemed to have been served on the fifth day after it was sent.

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

Issue(s) to be Decided

The issues to be decided are whether the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent and to a monetary Order for unpaid rent, pursuant to sections 46, 55, & 67 of the *Residential Tenancy Act (Act)*.

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 December 23, 2013 for a tenancy beginning January 1, 2014 for the monthly rent of \$1500.00 due on 1st of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, June 6, 2014 with an effective vacancy date of June 20, 2014 due to \$1560.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay the rent owed for the month of June 2014 and that the tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by registered mail that was mailed on June 6, 2014, and therefore is deemed served five days later.

The Notice states that the tenant(s) had five days to pay the rent or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end. The tenant(s) 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(s) on June 11, 2014 and the effective date of the notice is amended to June 21, 2014 pursuant to section 53 of the *Act*. 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.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service on the tenant(s)**. This order must be served on the tenant(s) 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 section 67 in the amount of \$1500.00 comprised of the rent outstanding for the month of June 2014. This order must be served on the tenant(s) and may be filed in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and enforced as an order of that Court.

The applicants had claimed \$1560.00 for outstanding rent on the application for Dispute Resolution, however the tenancy agreement states that the rent is \$1500.00 and therefore that is the amount I have ordered.

The applicants have not specified what the extra \$60.00 is for, however after reading the tenancy agreement it appears to me that it is likely for parking fees however parking fees cannot be claimed on a Direct Request application. The remaining \$60.00 claim is therefore dismissed with leave to reapply.

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 26, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch