



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

DECISION

Dispute Codes

OPR, & MNR

Introduction

This matter was conducted by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 48(4) of the Act, and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession and a monetary order due to unpaid rent.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 12, 2011 the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act* determines that a document is deemed to have been served on the fifth day after it was sent.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenant has been served with the Dispute Resolution Direct Request Proceeding documents.

Issue(s) to be Decided

The issues to be decided are whether the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent and to a monetary Order for unpaid rent, pursuant to sections 39, 48, & 60 of the *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act (Act)*.

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on October 2, 2009 for a tenancy beginning September 1, 2009 for the monthly rent of \$100.00 due on 1st of the month; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on, December 14, 2010 with an effective vacancy date of December 24, 2010 due to \$1300.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord(s) indicates that the tenant(s) had failed to pay rent outstanding totaling \$1300.00 to the end of December 2010, and that the tenant was served a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by registered mail that was mailed on December 14, 2010 and therefore is deemed served five days later.

The Notice states that the tenant(s) had five days to pay the rent or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end. The tenant(s) did not apply to dispute the Notice to End Tenancy within five days.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and accept that the tenant has been served with notice to end tenancy as declared by the landlord. The notice is deemed to have been received by the tenant(s) on December 19, 2010 and the effective date of the notice is amended to December 29, 2010. I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 39 of the Act.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenant is conclusively presumed under section 39 of the Act to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service on the tenant(s)**. This order must be served on the tenant(s) and 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 60 in the amount of \$1300.00 comprised of the outstanding rent. This order must be served on the tenant(s) and 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: January 20, 2011.

Residential Tenancy Branch