



Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Pacific Village 2
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 July 24, 2014, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail.

Section 90 of the Act determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received 5 days after 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 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 Request Proceeding;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on July 1, 2013, indicating that the tenant is obligated to pay \$1,350.00 in rent in advance on the first day of the month;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the “Notice”) which the landlord served on the tenant on July 3 for \$4,120.00 in unpaid rent due in

the months of April – July inclusive (\$70.00 for April and \$1,350.00 for each of May, June and July); and

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice on the tenant by posting it to the door of the rental unit.

Section 90 of the Act provides that because the Notice was served by posting, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice 3 days later on July 6, 2014.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the Act which provides that the tenant had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

I find that the tenant received the Notice on July 6, 2014. I accept the landlord's undisputed evidence and I find that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears and did not apply to dispute the Notice and is therefore conclusively presumed to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice. I grant the landlord an order of possession which must be served on the tenant. Should the tenant fail to comply with the order, it may be filed for enforcement in the Supreme Court.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay \$4,120.00 in rent for the months of April - July. I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the rental arrears and I grant the landlord a monetary order for \$4,120.00. This order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an order of that Court.

Conclusion

I grant the landlord an order of possession and a monetary order for \$4,120.00.

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: August 05, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch

