



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding SWIFTSURE DEVELOPMENTS  
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 January 22, 2021, 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 January 27, 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 September 11, 1997, indicating a monthly rent of \$292.00, due on the first day of each month;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated January 5, 2021, for \$1,013.00 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 January 18, 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 1:50 pm on January 5, 2021;
- A copy of two receipts dated January 15, 2021, for payments of \$484.50 and \$150.00, which the landlord has indicated are "for use and occupancy only"; 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 sections 81 and 83 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on January 8, 2021, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full by January 13, 2021, 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, January 18, 2021.

Therefore, I find that the landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent owing for January 2021 as of January 19, 2021.

I note that the amount of rent on the tenancy agreement (\$292.00) does not match the amount of the monthly rent listed on the Direct Request Worksheet (1,013.00) and other documentation (\$478.00). When there have been rent increases, the appropriate Notice of Rent Increase forms must be submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution to substantiate the claim for the increased rent.

I find I am not able to confirm the precise 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: February 16, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch