



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 two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on December 5, 2016, the landlords sent the tenants the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings.

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 Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords and the tenants on December 20, 2011, indicating a monthly rent of \$875.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on January 1, 2012;
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy; and
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated November 1, 2016, and sent to the tenants by mail on November 2, 2016, with a stated effective vacancy date of November 16, 2016, for \$875.00 in unpaid rent.

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

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 that such evidentiary material 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.

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 landlords on the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for Tenant D.J. 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*.

I find that the tracking number provided by the landlords on the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding for Tenant H.J. 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 captured for the delivery of this Xpress Post mailing, however I find that the signature recorded by Canada Post does not match the signature of Tenant H.J. as it appears on the residential tenancy agreement submitted by the landlords. For this reason, I am unable to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents on Tenant H.J.

Since I find that the landlords have not served the tenants 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: December 15, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch