



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 21, 2021, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request. The landlord had the tenant and a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 82 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were duly served to the tenant on May 21, 2021.

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 by the landlord and the tenant on February 10, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$525.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on February 12, 2015
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$597.32 to the monthly rent amount of \$612.85
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated April 7, 2021, for \$1,300.70 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 April 21, 2021
- 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 3:05 pm on April 7, 2021
- A ledger showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 81 and 93 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was served on April 7, 2021 and is deemed to have been received by the tenant on April 10, 2021, 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 section 39(5) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the effective date of the 10 Day Notice, April 21, 2021.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of the date of this application, May 10, 2021.

I note that the amount of the monthly rent on the tenancy agreement (\$525.00) does not match the amount of starting rent on the Notice of Rent Increase (\$597.32). When there have been rent increases, all appropriate Notice of Rent Increase forms must be submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution to substantiate each stage of the increased rent.

I find I am not able to confirm the amount of rent owing and 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 31, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch