



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding SPRUCE CAPITAL TRAILER PARK 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 April 8, 2022.

The landlord submitted a copy of a Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form signed by the tenant which declares that on April 21, 2022, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request.

Based on the written submissions and evidence of the landlord and in accordance with section 82(1) of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served to the tenant on April 21, 2022.

Issues 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 relevant evidentiary material:

- a copy of a manufactured home park tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on July 3, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$360.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on August 1, 2019;
- a copy of one Notice of Rent Increase form, showing the rent being increased from \$360.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$366.74;
- a copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (the “10 Day Notice”) dated March 23, 2022, for \$865.22 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 3, 2022;
- 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 1:51pm on March 23, 2022; and;
- a copy of a Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant period.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 81 and 83 of the *Act*, I find that the 10 Day Notice was served on March 23, 2022 and is deemed to have been received by the tenant on March 26, 2022, three days after it was posted to the door of the rental unit.

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, April 5, 2022.

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

I find that the monthly breakdown of rent owing on the Direct Request Worksheet is incomplete as there is an unexplained opening balance of \$473.48. The Direct Request Worksheet must clearly show all months for which the tenant still owes rent in order to substantiate the landlord’s claim.

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.

The landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed 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 17, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch