



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes FF, OPR

Introduction

This hearing dealt with an application by the landlord for an order of possession, a monetary order and an order to retain the security deposit in partial satisfaction of the claim. The landlord participated in the conference call hearing but the tenant(s) did not. The landlord presented evidence that the tenants were served with the application for dispute resolution and notice of hearing by personal service on October 14, 2011. I found that the tenants had been properly served with notice of the landlord's claim and the date and time of the hearing and the hearing proceeded in their absence.

Issues to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an order of possession?

Is the landlord entitled to a monetary order for unpaid rent and loss of income?

Background and Evidence

The tenancy began on or about five years ago however the landlord could not be sure. Rent in the amount of \$800.00 is payable in advance on the first day of each month. The tenant failed to pay rent in the month(s) of May and on May 5, 2011 the landlord served the tenant with a notice to end tenancy. The tenant further failed to pay rent in the month(s) of June 2011 – November 2011. The landlord advised that “we’re farmers and we’ve been extremely busy working that it took till now to get this sorted out”.

Analysis

I accept the landlord's undisputed testimony and I find that the tenant was served with a notice to end tenancy for non-payment of rent. The tenant did not pay the outstanding rent within 5 days of receiving the notice and did not apply for dispute resolution to dispute the notice and is therefore conclusively presumed to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the notice. Based on the above facts I find that the landlord is entitled to an order of possession. The tenant must be served with the order of possession. Should the tenant fail to comply with the order, the order may be filed in the Supreme Court of British Columbia and enforced as an order of that Court.

The landlord chose not to pursue a monetary order in this matter as they stated "we have no hope of ever recovering that money". The landlord is however entitled to the recovery of the \$50.00 filing fee. I grant the landlord an order under section 67 for the balance due of \$50.00. This order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an order of that Court.

Conclusion

The landlord is granted an order of possession and a monetary order for \$50.00.

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: November 07, 2011.

Residential Tenancy Branch