



# 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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 8, 2015, the landlord “EY” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlords 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. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “KY” and a signature for KY is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords, 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 June 13, 2015, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

### Background and Evidence

The landlords 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 “EY” and the tenant on April 21, 2009, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,750.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on May 1, 2009;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlords establish a monetary claim in the amount of \$1,750.00 for unpaid rent for the month of May 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated May 28, 2015, which the landlords state was served to the tenant on May 28, 2015 for \$1,750.00 in unpaid rent due on May 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of June 7, 2015;
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice on which the landlord “EY” attests that she served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on May 28, 2015. The Proof of Service establishes that the service was witnessed by “KY” and a signature for KY is included on the form; and
- Two photographs which depict that the Notice was inserted into the gap between the two “double doors” which form the front entrance of the rental unit.

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 landlords 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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 88 of the *Act* provides the approved methods by which documents can be served. Section 88 reads, in part, as follows:

**88** All documents, other than those referred to in section 89 [*special rules for certain documents*], that are required or permitted under this Act to be given to or served on a person must be given or served in one of the following ways:

- (a) by leaving a copy with the person;
- (b) if the person is a landlord, by leaving a copy with an agent of the landlord;
- (c) by sending a copy by ordinary mail or registered mail to the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, to the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;
- (d) if the person is a tenant, by sending a copy by ordinary mail or registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant;
- (e) by leaving a copy at the person's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the person;
- (f) by leaving a copy in a mail box or mail slot for the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, for the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;
- (g) by attaching a copy to a door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, at the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;
- (h) by transmitting a copy to a fax number provided as an address for service by the person to be served;
- (i) as ordered by the director under section 71 (1) [*director's orders: delivery and service of documents*];

On the first page of the Proof of Service of the Notice form, the landlord "EY" has checked a box indicating that the Notice was attached to the door. However, the landlord EY also states, under the "special details" section, that the Notice was inserted into the front door and provided instructions to refer to the pictures included as evidence as part of the application. On the second page of the Proof of Service of the Notice form, the landlord EY provided further information to convey that there was no answer and that the Notice was inserted into the front door. The photographs provided as part of the application depict that the Notice was inserted into the gap created between the

two “double doors” which form the front entrance of the rental unit. Based on the submissions and evidence provided by the landlord EY, I find that the Notice was not attached to the door as permitted under section 88 of the *Act*. Rather, the landlord inserted the Notice into a gap created between the two front doors. Service of the Notice in this manner is not permitted under section 88 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I find that the landlord has not demonstrated that the Notice was attached to the door, as indicated on the Proof of Service of the Notice form. I further find that the tenant has not been served with the Notice in a manner consistent with the service provisions for documents as provided under section 88 of the *Act*. I also find that there is no evidence before me that establishes that the landlord was given leave to serve the Notice in an alternative fashion as ordered by a delegate of the director of the Residential Tenancy Branch in accordance with section 88(i) of the *Act*.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the landlord has not demonstrated that the Notice was properly served in accordance with the *Act*, and therefore, the Notice is set aside and is of no force and 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 May 28, 2015 Notice, without leave to reapply. The landlord may wish to serve a new Notice to the tenant if the landlord so wishes.

I dismiss the landlords’ application for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

### Conclusion

I dismiss the landlords’ application for an Order of Possession without leave to reapply.  
I dismiss the landlords’ 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: June 09, 2015

---

Residential Tenancy Branch

