DECISION

<u>Dispute Codes</u> OPR MNR MNSD FF

<u>Introduction</u>

This hearing proceeded by way of Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the Act, and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the Landlord for an Order of Possession, a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, to keep the security deposit, and to recover the cost of the filing fee from the Tenants for this application.

The Landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on November 25, 2009 the Limited Company served each Tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding in person and the proof of service form was signed with an illegible signature.

Analysis

The Landlord submitted a copy of the proof of service of the Notice of Direct Request form which indicates that the Limited company performed the service. I note that a company cannot perform service of documents and the individual who performed the service of the documents, as either the landlord or the landlord's agent, must list their full name on the proof of service form and sign at the bottom of the form attesting to the service.

As a company cannot perform service of documents I find that the proof of service document submitted into evidence to be invalid. In the absence of a valid proof of service form, I find that the Landlord has failed to prove that service of the Notice of Direct Request has been effected in accordance with the Act, and I hereby dismiss this application with leave to reapply.

\sim		
('An	\sim	lusion
OUL	v	usion

I HEREBY DISMISS the Landlord's application, 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 *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: December 10, 2009.	

Dispute Resolution Officer