



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Capital Region Housing Corporation and
[tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPQ FF

Introduction

This hearing was convened as a result of the Landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution. The participatory hearing was held on August 13, 2020. The Landlord applied for the following relief, pursuant to the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "Act"):

- an order of possession based on a 2-Month Notice to End Tenancy because the Tenant no longer qualifies for subsidized housing (the Notice)
- recovery of the filing fee

The Landlord's Agent (the "Landlord") provided testimony at the hearing. The Tenant did not attend the hearing.

The Landlord testified that she attached a copy of the Notice of Hearing along with supporting documentary evidence to the front door of the rental unit on July 13, 2020. Pursuant to section 90 of the *Act*, documents served in this manner are deemed to be received 3 days later. I find the Tenant is deemed to have received the Notice of Hearing on July 16, 2020.

The Landlord was provided the opportunity to present evidence orally and in written and documentary form, and to make submissions to me. I have reviewed all oral and written evidence before me that met the requirements of the Rules of Procedure. However, only the evidence relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this Decision.

Issue to be Decided

- Is the landlord entitled to an order of possession under the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The Landlord testified that she served the Tenant with the Notice by posting a copy to the door of the rental unit on March 16, 2020. The effective date of the Notice is listed as May 30, 2020.

As per the tenancy agreement provided into evidence, the Landlord holds a security deposit in the amount of \$350.00.

The Notice indicates the reasons for ending the tenancy are:

- The Tenant no longer qualifies for subsidized housing

The Landlord explained that the Tenant no longer meets their criteria for housing, and can no longer live in the unit she rents. The Landlord attached their policy for eligibility.

Analysis

Based on the testimony and documentary evidence, and on a balance of probabilities, I find:

Section 49.1 of the *Act* permits a landlord to end a tenancy if the Tenant no longer qualifies for subsidized housing. A tenant who receives a notice to end tenancy under this part of the *Act* has 15 days after receipt to dispute it by making an application for dispute resolution. Failure to dispute the notice to end tenancy for cause in this period results in the conclusive presumption that the tenant has accepted the end of the tenancy.

In this case, the Landlord issued the Notice on the bases indicated above. Based on the Landlord's testimony, I am satisfied that the Landlord served the Tenant with the Notice, by posting a copy to the door of the rental unit on March 16, 2020. Pursuant to sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, documents served in this manner are deemed to be received 3 days later. I find the Tenant received the Notice on March 19, 2020.

The effective date of the Notice was set to be May 30, 2020. However, I note that on March 30, 2020, all pre-existing Notices to End Tenancy were suspended. This suspension (for this type of Notice) lasted until June 24, 2020. I note that Notices issued prior to March 30, 2020, may still be valid. However, they will only take effect after June 24, 2020, which is the date the eviction ban for this type of Notice was lifted.

Since the Notice was issued prior to the March 30, 2020, eviction suspension order, I find it was valid. I also find it meets the form and content requirements under section 52 of the Act.

The Tenant had 15 days after receipt of the Notice, until April 3, 2020, to dispute the notice. There is no evidence the Tenant applied to dispute the Notice. Accordingly, pursuant to section 49.1 (6) of the *Act*, I find the Tenant is conclusively presumed to have accepted the end of the tenancy.

The Landlord is entitled to an order of possession, which will be effective 2 days after it is served on the Tenant.

Further, section 72 of the *Act* gives me authority to order the repayment of a fee for an application for dispute resolution. Since the Landlord was successful in this hearing, I also order the Tenant to repay the \$100.00 fee the Landlord paid to make the application for dispute resolution. Section 72 of the *Act* also allows me to authorize that the security and pet deposit, currently held by the Landlord, be kept and used to offset the amount of rent still owed by the Tenant. I authorize the Landlord to retain \$100.00 from the Tenant's security deposit, leaving a security deposit balance of \$250.00. The remaining security deposit must be dealt with in accordance with the Act.

Conclusion

The Landlord is granted an order of possession effective **two days after service** on the Tenant. This order must be served on the Tenant. If the Tenant fails to comply with this order the Landlord may file the order with the Supreme Court of British Columbia and be 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: August 13, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch