



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding San Stel Investments Ltd.
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded 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 for unpaid rent.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding; it declared that on August 19, 2014, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail.

Pursuant to Section 90 of the *Residential Tenancy Act* a document served in this manner is deemed to have been served five days later.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, I find that the tenant has been duly served 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 a monetary order for unpaid rent and if so, in what amount?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following documents:

- Copies of the Proofs of Service of the Notice of Direct Proceeding for the tenant;
- A copy of a manufactured home pad tenancy agreement which was signed by the parties on May 1, 2001, providing for a monthly rent of \$364.00 due on the first day of the month; and

- Copies of Notices of Rent Increase, the latest raising the rent to \$510.86 effective May 1, 2014;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent which was issued on August 2, 2014 with a stated effective vacancy date of August 12, 2014, for \$530.86 in unpaid rent.

Documents filed by the landlord established that the tenant failed to pay all rent owed and was served the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent by attaching a copy on the door, on August 2, 2014. Section 90 of the Act deems the tenant was served on August 5, 2014.

The Notice stated that the tenant had five days from the service date to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice to End Tenancy within five days from the date of service.

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.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant have failed to pay the rent owed in full within the 5 days granted under section 46 (4) of the *Act*.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenant is conclusively presumed under section 46(5) of the Act to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the Notice. Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of possession and a monetary Order for unpaid rent.

Conclusion

I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession effective **two days after service** on the tenant and this 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 to section 67 in the amount of **\$510.86**, comprised of rent owed for August. The landlord did not provide evidence to support a claim that there was any amount owed for rent in addition to the rent for August.

This Order must be served on the tenants 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 *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act*.

Dated: August 29, 2014

Residential Tenancy Branch

