



# 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 April 9, 2015, the landlord 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 April 14, 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 on March 31, 2013 and signed by the tenant on April 1, 2013, indicating a monthly rent of \$800.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on April 1, 2013;

- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$800.00 for outstanding rent owing for April 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated April 3, 2015, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on April 3, 2015, for \$800.00 in unpaid rent due on April 1, 2015;
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of personal service via hand-delivery at 7:30 pm on April 3, 2015. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by "TM" and a signature for TM 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

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.

Section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

**52** *In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must*

- (a) be signed and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,*
- (b) give the address of the rental unit,*
- (c) state the effective date of the notice,...and*
- (e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...*

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and find that the Notice, dated April 3, 2015, served to the tenant does not adhere to the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. The Notice does not include the address of rental unit, as established in the tenancy agreement and on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, therefore making the Notice incomplete.

In a participatory hearing it may be possible to amend certain deficiencies with respect to the Notice or to seek clarification from the parties, however, in the limited scope of the Direct Request process, the *Act* does not allow an adjudicator to input an address where none is provided on the Notice. Therefore, I find that the Notice is not in compliance with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act* and is set aside and is of no force and effect.

As the landlords' 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 April 3, 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 April 3, 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 13, 2015

---

Residential Tenancy Branch

