



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR

### 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.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 29, 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. 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 July 04, 2016, 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*?

### 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 and the tenant, indicating a monthly rent of \$700.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on November 01, 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 April 21, 2016, and posted to the tenant's door on April 21, 2016, for \$830.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 11:00 a.m. on April 24, 2016. The 10 Day Notice states that the tenants 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

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. The onus is on the landlord to present evidentiary material that 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 find that the copy of the 10 Day Notice provided by the landlord is not sufficient as the effective date, indicating the date when the tenant must move out of the rental unit, is not visible as it is cut out of the copy. I find that I am not able to determine whether this 10 Day Notice is in accordance with section 52 of the *Act*.

For the above reason, the landlord's application is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order 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 12, 2016

---

Residential Tenancy Branch