



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding CREATIVE CENTRE SOCIETY FOR MENTAL
WELLNESS and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPC

Introduction

On April 1, 2021, the Landlord applied for a Dispute Resolution proceeding seeking an Order of Possession based on a One Month Notice to End Tenancy for Cause (the "Notice") pursuant to Section 47 of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "Act").

J.R. attended the hearing as an agent for the Landlord and the Tenant attended the hearing as well. At the outset of the hearing, I explained to the parties that as the hearing was a teleconference, none of the parties could see each other, so to ensure an efficient, respectful hearing, this would rely on each party taking a turn to have their say. As such, when one party is talking, I asked that the other party not interrupt or respond unless prompted by myself. Furthermore, if a party had an issue with what had been said, they were advised to make a note of it and when it was their turn, they would have an opportunity to address these concerns. The parties were also informed that recording of the hearing was prohibited and they were reminded to refrain from doing so. All parties acknowledged these terms. As well, all in attendance provided a solemn affirmation.

J.R. advised that the Notice of Hearing and evidence package was served to the Tenant by hand on April 8, 2021 and the Tenant confirmed that he received this package. Based on this undisputed testimony, and in accordance with Sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I am satisfied that the Tenant was duly served the Landlord's Notice of Hearing and evidence package. As such, this evidence will be accepted and considered when rendering this Decision.

The Tenant advised that he did not submit any evidence for consideration on this file.

All parties were given an opportunity to be heard, to present sworn testimony, and to make submissions. I have reviewed all oral submissions before me; however, only the evidence relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this Decision.

Issue(s) to be Decided

- Is the Landlord entitled to an Order of Possession?

Background and Evidence

While I have turned my mind to the accepted documentary evidence and the testimony of the parties, not all details of the respective submissions and/or arguments are reproduced here.

All parties agreed that the tenancy started on February 3, 2020, that rent was established at a subsidized amount of \$375.00 per month, and that it was due on the first day of each month. A security deposit of \$215.00 was also paid. A copy of the signed tenancy agreement was submitted as documentary evidence.

J.R. advised that the Notice was served to the Tenant by hand on February 1, 2021. The reason the Landlord served the Notice is because the “Tenant or a person permitted on the property by the tenant has significantly interfered with or unreasonably disturbed another occupant or the landlord.” The effective end date of the tenancy on the Notice was noted as April 1, 2021.

The Tenant advised that he did not make an Application to dispute the Notice.

Analysis

Upon consideration of the evidence before me, I have provided an outline of the following Sections of the *Act* that are applicable to this situation. My reasons for making this Decision are below.

Section 52 of the *Act* requires that any notice to end tenancy issued by a Landlord must be signed and dated by the Landlord, give the address of the rental unit, state the effective date of the notice, state the grounds for ending the tenancy, and be in the approved form.

With respect to the Notice served to the Tenant on February 1, 2021, I have reviewed this Notice to ensure that the Landlord has complied with the requirements as to the form and content of Section 52 of the *Act*. I find that this Notice meets all of the requirements of Section 52.

The undisputed evidence is that the Notice was served to the Tenant by hand on February 1, 2021. According to Section 47(4) of the *Act*, the Tenant had 10 days to dispute this Notice, and Section 47(5) of the *Act* states that *“If a tenant who has received a notice under this section does not make an application for dispute resolution in accordance with subsection (4), the tenant is conclusively presumed to have accepted that the tenancy ends on the effective date of the notice, and must vacate the rental unit by that date.”*

After being served the Notice, the tenth day fell on Thursday February 11, 2021 and the undisputed evidence is that the Tenant did not make an Application to dispute this Notice by that date. I find it important to note that the information with respect to the Tenant’s right to dispute the Notice is provided on the third page of the Notice.

Ultimately, as the Tenant did not dispute the Notice and as there was no evidence provided corroborating that the Tenant had any extenuating circumstances that prevented him from disputing the Notice, I am satisfied that the Tenant is conclusively presumed to have accepted the Notice. As such, I find that the Landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession. As J.R. requested that the Order of Possession be extended to allow for the Tenant to have more time to vacate the rental unit, I grant an Order of Possession to be effective at **1:00 PM on August 31, 2021 after service of this Order** on the Tenant.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the Landlord effective at **1:00 PM on August 31, 2021 after service of this Order** on the Tenant. This Order must be served on the Tenant by the Landlord. Should the Tenant fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

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: July 20, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch