



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Fraser Ridge Apts.
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 signed Proofs of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding; they declared that on May 30, 2014, the landlord's representative served each tenant personally with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding

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

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession?

Is the landlord entitled to a monetary order for unpaid rent and if so, in what amount?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following documents:

- Copies of the Proofs of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on December 7, 2012, providing for a monthly rent of \$715.00 due on the first day of the month as well as a Notice of Rent Increase raising the rent to \$735.00 effective December 1, 2013; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on May 9, 2014 with a stated effective vacancy date of May 19, 2014, for \$462.57 in unpaid rent.

Documents filed by the landlord established that the tenants failed to pay all rent owed and were served the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by posting on the

door, on May 9, 2014. Section 90 of the Act deems the tenant was served on May 12, 2014.

The Notice stated that the tenants had five days from the service date to pay the rent in full 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 from the date of service.

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.

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. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of possession and a monetary Order 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.

I find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant to section 67 in the amount of **\$189.96**, comprised of rent owed. This takes into account a payment of \$272.43 made by the tenants after the Notice to End Tenancy was served that was accepted for use and occupancy only.

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: June 19, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch

