



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR, FFL

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 an unsigned Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on October 5, 2017, the landlord posted the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit.

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*?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which has not been signed by the landlord or the tenant, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,300.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 1, 2017;
- 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) with a stated effective vacancy date of September 20, 2017, for \$2,300.00 in unpaid rent.

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.

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 have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the 10 Day Notice is not signed or dated by the landlord. I find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not complied with the provisions of section 52 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 with a stated effective date of September 20, 2017, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice with a stated effective date of September 20, 2017 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reasons identified in the 10 Day Notice the landlord's application for a Monetary Order is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice with a stated effective date of September 20, 2017, is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice with a stated effective date of September 20, 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: October 10, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch