



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Vancouver Eviction Services  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR, MNR, MNSD, MNDC, FF

### Introduction

This hearing dealt with an application for dispute resolution by the landlords for an order of possession, a monetary order and an order to retain the security deposit in partial satisfaction of the claim. Although served with the Application for Dispute Resolution and Notice of Hearing by registered mail deemed delivered October 30, 2015, the tenants did not appear.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

- Is the landlord entitled to an order of possession and, if so, upon what terms?
- Is the landlord entitled to a monetary order and, if so, in what amount?
- Is the landlord entitled to retain the security deposit?

### Background and Evidence

This month-to-month tenancy commenced February 1, 2013. The monthly rent of \$900.00 is due on the first day of the month. The tenants paid a security deposit of \$450.00.

The landlord testified that the tenant was served with a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Non-Payment of Rent That document includes information advising the tenant that the notice is cancelled if the tenant paid the arrears of rent within five days. It also advises that the tenant has five days to dispute the notice by filing an application for dispute resolution with the Residential Tenancy Branch. The landlord testified that the tenant did neither.

The landlord testified that the tenant had not paid the rent for June, July, August, September, October, November and December and the arrears total \$6300.00.

### Analysis

Based on the above, the testimony and evidence, and on a balance of probabilities, I find as follows:

The tenants have not paid the outstanding rent and did not apply to dispute the Notice and are therefore conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the *Residential Tenancy Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the

Notice. Based on the above facts I find that the landlords are entitled to an order of possession effective two days after service on the tenants.

I find that the landlords have established a total monetary claim of \$6350.00 comprised of arrears of rent in the amount of \$6300.00 and the \$50.00 fee paid by the landlords for this application. However, the landlords limited their claim to \$5000. 00, plus the filing fee. I order that the landlord retain the deposit of \$450.00 in partial satisfaction of the claim and I grant the landlord an order under section 67 for the balance due of \$4600.00.

Conclusion

- a. An order of possession effective two days after service on the tenant has been granted. If necessary, this order may be filed in the Supreme Court and enforced as an order of that Court.
- b. A monetary order in favour of the landlord in the amount of \$4600.00 has been granted. If necessary, it 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: December 17, 2015

---

Residential Tenancy Branch

