



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR

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 November 26, 2017, the landlord served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding.

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 a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on November 21, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$700.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2016;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated November 8, 2017 for \$540.00 in unpaid rent (the 10 Day Notice). The 10 Day Notice provides 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 on the stated effective vacancy date of November 18, 2017;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was signed by the tenant, indicating that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 5:00 pm on November 8, 2017; and
- A Monetary Order Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

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 material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need 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 section 89 of the *Act*.

On the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, I find that the landlord has not selected an option to indicate which method was used to serve the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenant.

I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request to the tenant, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process, and for this reason, the landlord's application is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession 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: November 28, 2017

Residential Tenancy Branch