



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 landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on July 14, 2015, the landlord “AM” 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 associated with this 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 landlords on May 18, 2015 and signed by the tenant on May 28, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,000.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2015;

- 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 \$1,000.00 for unpaid rent owing for the month of July 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated July 5, 2015, which the landlords state was served to the tenant on July 6, 2015 for \$1,000.00 in unpaid rent due on July 1, 2015, with a stated effective vacancy date of July 15, 2015; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord “AM” served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on July 6, 2015. The Proof of Service establishes that the service was witnessed by “AD” and a signature for “AD” is included on the form. The Proof of Service of the Notice form also states, on the first page, that the Notice was served to the tenant by way of hand-delivery on July 4, 2015.

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 89 of the Act provides the approved methods by which an application for dispute resolution can be served. Section 89 provides, in part, as follows:

Special rules for certain documents

89 (1) An application for dispute resolution or a decision of the director to proceed with a review under Division 2 of Part 5, when required to be given to one party by another, must be given 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 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 registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant;
- (e) as ordered by the director under section 71 (1) [*director's orders: delivery and service of documents*].

(2) An application by a landlord under section 55 [*order of possession for the landlord*], 56 [*application for order ending tenancy early*] or 56.1 [*order of possession: tenancy frustrated*] must be given to the tenant in one of the following ways:

- (a) by leaving a copy with the tenant;
- (b) by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the tenant resides;
- (c) by leaving a copy at the tenant's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant;
- (d) by attaching a copy to a door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the tenant resides;
- (e) as ordered by the director under section 71 (1) [*director's orders: delivery and service of documents*].

(3) A notice under section 94.21 [*notice of administrative penalty*] must be given in a manner referred to in subsection (1).

In the Direct Request process, the landlord must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per subsections 89(1) and (2) of the *Act*, which permit service “by sending a copy by 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.” The definition of registered mail is set out in section 1 of the *Act* as “any method of mail delivery provided by Canada Post for which confirmation of delivery to a named person is available.”

I find that the tracking number provided by the landlord on the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form is for an item sent by Canada Post's Xpress Post service, which may or may not require a signature from the intended recipient to confirm delivery of the document to the person named as the respondent. In this case, Canada Post's Online Tracking System shows that a signature was not received from the intended recipient for the delivery of this Xpress Post mailing and, as such, this mailing does not meet the definition of registered mail as defined under the *Act*. I further find that there is no evidence before me that establishes that the landlord was given leave to serve the Direct Request Proceeding documents in an alternate fashion as ordered by a delegate of the director of the Residential Tenancy Branch in accordance with sections 89(1)(e) or 89(2)(e) of the *Act*.

Since I find that the landlords have not served the tenant with notice of this application in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

The landlords' application is dismissed 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: July 30, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

