



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding G & M Liske Developments Ltd  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR-DR, MNR-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 to obtain an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, to obtain monetary compensation for unpaid rent, and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

This decision is written based on the Application for Dispute Resolution, evidence, and submissions provided by the landlord on August 10, 2021.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on August 27, 2021, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request 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 Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on August 27, 2021 and are deemed to have been received by the tenant on September 1, 2021, 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 by the landlord and the tenant on August 18, 2010, indicating a monthly rent of \$387.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on September 15, 2010
- A copy of four Notice of Rent Increase forms, showing the rent being increased from \$450.65 to the monthly rent amount of \$513.86
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 20, 2021, for \$1,027.70 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 August 2, 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 4:54 pm on July 20, 2021
- 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 sections 81 and 93 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was served on July 20, 2021 and is deemed to have been received by the tenant on July 23, 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, August 2, 2021.

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

I note the landlord submitted a copy of Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$450.65 to \$513.86. However, I find the landlord has not submitted a copy of any Notices of Rent Increase showing the rent was legally increased from the \$387.00 listed in the tenancy agreement to the \$450.65 that appears on the first rent increase form.

I also note that the Notice of Rent Increase for 2019 shows the rent was increased from \$483.60 to \$495.60. However, the 2020 rent increase form used a starting rent of \$495.70 to calculate the increase, instead of \$495.60.

I find I am not able to confirm the precise amount of the monthly rent 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: September 14, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch