



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding M'Akola Group of Societies  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR, MNDC, MNR, MNSD, FF

### Introduction and Preliminary Matters

This hearing was convened in response to the landlord's application for dispute resolution under the Residential Tenancy Act (the "Act"). The landlord applied for an order of possession for the rental unit due to unpaid rent, a monetary order for money owed or compensation for damage or loss and unpaid rent, for authority to keep all or part of the tenants' security deposit, and for recovery of the filing fee paid for this application.

The landlord's agents attended at the hearing; the tenants did not attend.

The landlord's agent testified that they served the tenants with their Application for Dispute Resolution and Notice of Hearing documents (the Hearing Package) by registered mail; however the landlord confirmed that their Hearing Package for the tenants was sent to the tenants in the same envelope. The landlord further confirmed that the registered mail was unclaimed.

### Analysis and Conclusion

Section 89 of the Residential Tenancy Act and Section 3.1 of the Dispute Resolution Rules of Procedure (Rules) determines the method of service for documents and require that each tenant be served with the applicant's application. Residential Tenancy Branch Policy Guideline 12.3 as well states that each party must be served separately. In this case, there is no proof as to which tenant was sent the landlord's Hearing Package.

I find that this section of the Act, the Rules, Residential Tenancy Branch Policy Guideline and principles of natural justice and procedural fairness require that each respondent be served individually with a Hearing Package, and in this case, as the landlord chose registered mail for service of the documents, by separate registered mail envelopes.

Due to the above, I find that the landlord did not serve each tenant/respondent separately with their Notice of Hearing and Application for Dispute Resolution as required by the Act and the Rules and I dismiss the landlord's Application, with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

The landlord's application is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Leave to reapply is not an extension of any applicable limitation period.

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: April 23, 2015

---

Residential Tenancy Branch

