



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 48(4) of the *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act* (the *Act*), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The landlord submitted two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceedings which declares that on April 09, 2015, the landlord sent the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 14, 2015, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 39 and 48 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 60 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- Two copies of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceedings served to the tenants;
- A copy of a manufactured home park tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on November 01, 2008, indicating a monthly rent of \$260.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on November 01, 2008;

- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated February 16, 2015, and sent by registered mail to the tenants on February 16, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 03, 2015, for \$2,216.00 in unpaid rent.

Documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was sent by registered mail to the tenants at 12:35 p.m. on February 16, 2015. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenant had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 81 and 83 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on February 21, 2015, three days after its posting.

I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$260.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

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(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that 5 day period

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenant is conclusively presumed under section 39(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the 10 Day Notice, March 03, 2015.

Direct request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability of the tenants to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied. The onus is on the landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and that such evidentiary material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct

Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

I find that there is insufficient information on the monetary order worksheet regarding rent owed before February 05, 2015, as well as a discrepancy in the amount of the monthly rent on the worksheet which does not match the rent agreed to on the tenancy agreement, which leaves open questions that cannot be clarified within the purview of the Direct Request process.

The landlord's claim for a monetary Order is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing as of April 08, 2015.

Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlord effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. Should the tenant(s) fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

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: April 15, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

