



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding KJM HOLDINGS INC  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPRM-DR, FFL

### 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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 22, 2019, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenant and a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 82 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on May 22, 2019.

### 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*?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 65 of the *Act*?

### Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a manufactured home park tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on November 1, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$695.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 1, 2016;

- Two copies of Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$695.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$750.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated May 2, 2019, for \$2,680.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides 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 on the stated effective vacancy date of May 13, 2019;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was signed by the tenant and indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 6:00 pm on May 2, 2019; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 81 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on May 2, 2019.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 39(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that five 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, May 13, 2019.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of May 15, 2019.

Part 4, section 34 of the *Act* establishes that “a landlord must not increase rent except in accordance with this Part.”

Part 4, section 35(2) of the *Act* establishes that the landlord “must give a tenant notice of a rent increase at least 3 months before the effective date of the increase”, and section 35(3) of the *Act* states that “A notice of a rent increase must be in the approved form.”

I find that the first Notice of Rent Increase submitted by the landlord is not signed or dated. Therefore, I find I am not able to determine whether the landlord provided the full three months’ notice as required under section 35(2) of the *Act*.

For this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the landlord was partially successful in this application, I find that the landlord is entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

### Conclusion

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

Pursuant to section 65 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlord is provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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: May 24, 2019

---

Residential Tenancy Branch