



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 February 04, 2016, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this 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 tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on October 28, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$870.00 for a tenancy commencing on October 28, 2015;

- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated January 21, 2016, and personally handed to the tenant on January 21, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of January 31, 2016, for \$1,200.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally handed to the tenant at 5:40 p.m. on January 21, 2016. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenant had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was duly served with the 10 Day Notice on January 21, 2016.

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 of 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 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 is for a package sent by Canada Post’s Xpress Post mailing, which may or may not require a signature from the individual 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 required for the delivery of this Xpress Post mailing and, as such, does not meet the definition of registered mail as defined under the *Act*. Since I find that the landlord has not served the tenant with notice of this application in accordance with Section 89 of the *Act*, I dismiss the landlord’s application

for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

I note that the tenancy agreement submitted by the landlord does not indicate the day in the month that the rent is due and there is no addendum, signed by the tenant, which establishes the day in the month that the rent is due. For this reason, this application is not suitable for the direct request process and would be sent to a participatory hearing if the same application is resubmitted.

Conclusion

The landlord's 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: February 11, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch

