



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Christie Point Apartments
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes

OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter was conducted 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.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 24, 2014 the landlord served each tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail sent to the rental unit address. The landlord provided a Canada Post receipt and tracking number as evidence of service to each tenant.

Section 90 of the Act determines that a document is deemed to have been served on the 5th day after mailing.

Therefore, based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenants have been served, pursuant to sections 89 and 90 of the Act, with the Direct Request Proceeding documents.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of possession?

Is the landlord entitled to 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 Proceeding for each tenant;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on June 1, 2012, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,259.00 due on the 1st day of the month;
- A Notice of Rent Increase issued on March 25, 2013 increasing the rent from \$1,259.00 to \$1,306.00 effective July 1, 2013; and
- A copy of a 10 day Notice to end tenancy for unpaid rent or utilities which was issued on September 15, 2014 with a stated effective vacancy date of September 26, 2014, for \$1,316.00 in unpaid rent due September 1, 2014.

The tenancy agreement and notice of rent increase were issued in the same landlord name. The application for dispute resolution and Notice to end tenancy were issued in a different landlord name. I note that the tenancy agreement does include a notation that includes the landlord name used on the application and Notice to end tenancy.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the tenants failed to pay rent owed and were served the 10 day Notice to end tenancy for unpaid rent or utilities by posting to the tenant's door at 4:50 p.m. on September 15, 2014. The landlord submitted a signed proof of service document. The proof of service was also signed by witness M.S.; declaring he witnessed C.S. post the Notice.

The Notice indicated that the Notice would be automatically cancelled if the landlord received \$1,316.00 within 5 days after the tenants were assumed to have received the Notice. The Notice also indicated that the tenants were presumed to have accepted that the tenancy was ending and that the tenants must move out of the rental by the date set out in the Notice unless the tenants filed an Application for Dispute Resolution within 5 days.

The landlord has claimed unpaid September 2014 rent in the sum of \$1,306.00.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and accept that the tenants have been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlord.

Section 90 of the Act stipulates that a document that is posted on a door is deemed to be received on the 3rd day after it is posted. Therefore, I find that the tenants received the Notice to end tenancy on September 18, 2014.

Section 46(1) of the Act stipulates that a 10 day Notice ending tenancy is effective 10 days after the date that the tenant receives the Notice. As the tenants are deemed to have received this Notice on September 18, 2014, I find that the earliest effective date of the Notice is September 28, 2014.

Section 53 of the Act stipulates that if the effective date stated in a Notice is earlier than the earliest date permitted under the legislation, the effective date is deemed to be the earliest date that complies with the legislation. Therefore, I find that the effective date of this Notice to End Tenancy was September 28, 2014.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I find that the tenants were served with a Notice ending tenancy that required the tenants to vacate the rental unit on September 28, 2014, pursuant to section 46 of the Act.

Section 46 of the Act stipulates that a tenant has 5 days from the date of receiving the Notice ending tenancy to either pay the outstanding rent or to file an Application for Dispute Resolution to dispute the Notice.

In the circumstances before me I have no evidence that the tenants exercised either of these rights; therefore, pursuant to section 46(5) of the Act, I find that the tenants are conclusively presumed to have accepted that the tenancy has ended on the effective date of the Notice; September 28, 2014.

Therefore, I find, pursuant to section 55 of the Act, that the landlord is entitled to an Order of possession effective **two days after service** on the tenant. The Order may be filed in the Supreme Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

I find that the landlord is entitled to monetary compensation, pursuant section 65 of the Act, in the amount of \$1,306.00 September 2014 rent owed and I grant an Order in that amount. This Order must be served on the tenant and may be filed in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and enforced as an Order of that Court.

Conclusion

The landlord is entitled to an Order of possession and a monetary Order for unpaid rent.

This decision is final and binding and 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: October 01, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch

