

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR MNR MNSD FF

### Introduction

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 Landlords for an Order of Possession for unpaid rent, a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, and to recover the cost of the filing fee from the Tenant for this application.

The Landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 15, 2010, the male Landlord served the Tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. An “incomplete” copy of a Canada Post Receipt was submitted in the Landlords’ evidence, listing the Tenant’s name and postal code.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

The issues to be decided are whether the Landlord is entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent; to a Monetary Order for unpaid rent; and to recover the filing fee from the Tenant for the cost of the Application for Dispute Resolution, pursuant to sections 55 and 72 of the *Residential Tenancy Act (Act)*.

### Analysis

The Landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 15, 2010, the Landlords served the Tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail however the Landlord has failed to complete the registered mail receipt to prove which address the registered mail package was sent to.

The purpose of serving documents under the *Act* is to notify the person being served of their breach and notification of their rights under the *Act* in response. The Landlords are

seeking to end the tenancy due to this breach; however, the Landlords have the burden of proving that the Tenant was served with notice of the Direct Request Proceeding in accordance with the Act.

In the presence of incomplete information pertaining to the service of the Direct Request Proceeding documents I find that the Landlords have failed to establish that service was effected in accordance with the Act. Having found that the Landlords have failed to prove service of the notice of Direct Request Proceeding I have determined that this application be dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the Landlords have not been successful with their claim I decline to award them recovery of the filing fee.

#### Conclusion

**I HEREBY DISMISS** the Landlords' 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: March 24, 2010.

---

Dispute Resolution Officer