



# 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-DR, 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 November 4, 2020, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 82 and 83 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on November 9, 2020, 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*?

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

### Background and Evidence

I have reviewed all written submissions and evidence before me; however, only the evidence and submissions relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

The landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a manufactured home park tenancy agreement which was signed the tenant on October 4, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$640.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 1, 2016;
- A copy of three Notice of Rent Increase forms, showing the rent being increased from \$640.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$707.47;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated October 19, 2020, for \$707.47 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 October 29, 2020;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 2:33 (a.m. or p.m. not indicated) on October 19, 2020; 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 I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$707.47, as per the tenancy agreement and the Notices of Rent Increase.

In accordance with sections 81 and 83 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on October 22, 2020, three days after its posting.

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 sections 39(5) and 46(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, November 1, 2020.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession and a monetary Order in the amount of \$707.47, the amount claimed by the landlord, for unpaid rent owing for October 2020 as of the date of this application, October 29, 2020.

As the landlord was 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 sections 60 and 65 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is entitled to a Monetary Order in the amount of \$807.47 for rent owed for October 2020 and 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.

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: November 25, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch