



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding CASCADIA APARTMENT RENTALS LTD.

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 March 16, 2017, 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 March 21, 2017, 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*?

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 tenant;

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenant on September 13, 2012, indicating a monthly rent of \$880.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on September 16, 2012;
- Two copies of Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$880.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$935.00;
- 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 March 6, 2017, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 16, 2017, for \$985.00 in unpaid rent.

Witnessed documentary evidence filed by the landlord indicates that the 10 Day Notice was slid inside the unit through the tenant's door at 9:00 am on March 6, 2017. 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 that they served the tenant with the 10 Day Notice in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*.

Section 88 of the *Act* allows for service by either sending the 10 Day Notice to the tenant by registered mail, leaving a copy with the tenant, leaving a copy in the tenant's mailbox or mail slot, attaching a copy to the tenant's door or leaving a copy with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant.

In the special details section of the Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy, the landlord has indicated that they placed the 10 Day Notice through the door and into the rental unit. I find that the 10 Day Notice has not been served in accordance with section 88 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I dismiss the landlord's application to end this tenancy and obtain an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of March 6, 2017, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of March 6, 2017, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reason listed above, I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order with leave to reapply.

The landlord must reissue the 10 Day Notice and serve it in one of the ways prescribed by section 88 of the *Act*, or according to Residential Tenancy Policy Guideline #39, if the landlord wants to apply through the Direct Request process.

Conclusion

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of March 6, 2017 is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of March 6, 2017 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

This tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the *Act*.

I dismiss the landlord's 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: March 22, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch

