



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR, MNR

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential 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 March 26, 2015, the landlord’s agent “PS” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received 5 days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 31, 2015, 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 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord’s agent “PS” and the tenant on January 6, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$750.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on January 1, 2015. The tenancy agreement established that “the hydro was to be put in the tenant’s name”.

- On the second page of the Application for Direct Request, the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$266.71 for unpaid utilities;
- A copy of a letter, addressed to an individual identified as “W”, in which the landlord’s agent alerts the tenant to an enclosed hydro bill and conveys that the bill is the responsibility of the tenant;
- A copy of a hydro bill in the amount of \$266.71;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent and Utilities (the Notice) dated March 7, 2015, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on March 7, 2015, for \$266.71 in unpaid utilities due on February 15, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 17, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord’s agent PS served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on March 7, 2015. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “TS” and a signature for TS is included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the *Act* which provides that the tenant had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 90 of the *Act* provides that because the Notice was served by posting the Notice to the door of the rental unit, the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice three days after its posting. In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have received the Notice on March 10, 2015, three days after its posting.

Direct Request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability for the tenants to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on landlords in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the Notice, and all related documents with respect to the Direct Request process, in accordance with the *Act* and Policy Guidelines. In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the landlord to ensure that all submitted evidentiary material is in accordance with the prescribed criteria and does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need further clarification beyond the purview of a Direct Request Proceeding. If the landlord cannot establish that all documents meet the standard necessary to proceed via the Direct Request Proceeding, the application may be found to have deficiencies that necessitate a participatory hearing, or, in the alternative, the application may be dismissed.

Subsection 46(6) of the *Act*, reads in part as follows:

If

(a) a tenancy agreement requires the tenant to pay utility charges to the landlord, and

(b) the utility charges are unpaid more than 30 days after the tenant is given a written demand for payment of them,

the landlord may treat the unpaid utility charges as unpaid rent and may give notice under this section.

The tenancy agreement included as part of this application includes a term which reads: "Hydro to be put into tenants [sic] name." The landlord's agent provided a copy of a letter dated February 15, 2015, in which the tenant is alerted to an enclosed hydro bill and advised that he is responsible for the payment of the sum of the hydro bill. If a tenant is provided a written demand to provide payment of a utility charge for which he is responsible, the landlord may treat the unpaid utility charges as unpaid rent only if the utility charges remain unpaid more than 30 days after the written demand. As the landlord issued a Notice for unpaid utilities on March 7, 2015, I find that the landlord has not waited more than 30 days from the date of the written demand to the tenant, and has, therefore, issued the Notice to the tenant on a date earlier than permitted under the *Act*.

I therefore find that as the March 7, 2015 Notice was not properly served in accordance with the *Act*, it is set aside and of no effect.

As the landlord's application for an Order of Possession arises from a Notice that has been set aside, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession, based on the March 7, 2015 Notice, without leave to reapply. The landlord may wish to serve a new Notice to the tenant if the landlord so wishes.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession, based on the March 7, 2015 Notice, without leave to reapply. I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order 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: April 16, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

