DIRECT REQUEST DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

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 landlord for an Order of Possession and a monetary order.

Evidence indicates that the landlord received the Direct Request Proceeding package on July 25, 2011. The landlord submitted signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding declaring that the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail sent on July 26, 2011. The landlord included the registered mail tracking slip which documented the name of the party served. However, I find that there is no address shown on the registered mail tracking receipts.

Section 89(1) of the Act imposes specific requirements with resepect to how the applicant must serve a respondent with a Notice of Hearing. For that reason the address must be verified and all of the documentation relied upon must be complete in order to establish service to the specific person and address identified. I find that the landlord has not met the requisite burden of proof regarding the service of this application.

Having found that the landlord has failed to meet the proof of service requirement by showing the full name and the complete address where the mail had been sent, I find that this application cannot proceed and must be dismissed. Accordingly I hereby dismiss this application with leave to reapply.