



# 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 two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on January 24, 2018, the landlord served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided two copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 29, 2018, 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*?

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:

- Two copies of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenants;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord on September 22, 2017 and signed by the tenant “RC” on August 31, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,700.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on September 01, 2017;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question, on which the landlord establishes a monetary claim in the amount of \$8,100.00 for outstanding rent, comprised of the balance of unpaid rent owed for the period of November 2017 to January 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated January 10, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenants on January 10, 2018, for \$8,100.00 in unpaid rent due on January 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of January 20, 2018;
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice form showing that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of slipping the Notice under the door of the rental unit on January 10, 2018. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “JB” and a signature for “JB” is included on the form.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the Act which provides that the tenants had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenants did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlord alleged that the tenants did not pay the rental arrears.

## 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 for 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.

In this type of matter, the landlords must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the Notice, and all related documents with respect to the Direct Request process, in accordance with the *Act* and Policy Guidelines. 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 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.

Although a second individual, identified as “MC”, is listed as a respondent tenant on the application, neither the name nor signature for “MC” appears on the tenancy agreement to demonstrate that “MC” entered into a tenancy with the applicant landlord and endorsed the terms of the tenancy agreement as a tenant. Therefore, I will consider the landlord’s application against the tenant “RC” only.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 88 of the *Act* provides the approved methods by which documents can be served. Section 88 reads, in part, as follows:

**88** All documents, other than those referred to in section 89 [*special rules for certain documents*], that are required or permitted under this Act to be given to or served on a person must be given or served in one of the following ways:

- (a) by leaving a copy with the person;
- (b) if the person is a landlord, by leaving a copy with an agent of the landlord;
- (c) by sending a copy by ordinary mail or 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;
- (d) if the person is a tenant, by sending a copy by ordinary mail or registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant;
- (e) by leaving a copy at the person's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the person;
- (f) by leaving a copy in a mail box or mail slot for the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, for the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;
- (g) by attaching a copy to a door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, at the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;

- (h) by transmitting a copy to a fax number provided as an address for service by the person to be served;
- (i) as ordered by the director under section 71 (1) [*director's orders: delivery and service of documents*];

On the first page of the Proof of Service of the Notice form, the landlord has checked a box indicating that the Notice was attached to the door. However, the landlord provides additional information under the “special details” section, by stating that the Notice was slipped under the door of the rental unit.

I find that, by serving the Notice by way of slipping it under the door of the rental unit, the landlord has not served the Notice in a manner consistent with the service provisions for documents as provided under section 88 of the *Act*. I further find that there is no evidence before me that establishes that the landlord was given leave to serve the Notice in an alternative fashion as ordered by a delegate of the director of the Residential Tenancy Branch in accordance with section 88(i) of the *Act*. Based on the foregoing, I find that the landlord has not demonstrated that the Notice was properly served in accordance with the *Act*.

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 find that the Notice, dated January 10, 2018, served to the tenant does not adhere to the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. The Notice does not include the address of rental unit, as established in the tenancy agreement and on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, therefore making the Notice incomplete.

In a participatory hearing it may be possible to amend certain deficiencies with respect to the Notice or to seek clarification from the parties, however, in the limited scope of the Direct Request process, the *Act* does not allow an adjudicator to input an address where none is provided on the Notice. Therefore, I find that the Notice is not in compliance with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act* and is set aside and is of no force and effect.

Based on the deficiencies related to the service of the Notice, and with respect to the form and content of the Notice, as identified above, the January 10, 2018 Notice is set aside and is of no force and effect.

As the landlord's application for an Order of Possession arises from a Notice that has been set aside, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession, based on the January 10, 2018 Notice, without leave to reapply. I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

It remains open to the landlord to reapply for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process if all requirements for an application for dispute resolution via Direct Request, as outlined in Policy Guideline #39, can be met, or, in the alternative, the landlord may wish to submit an application for dispute resolution to be heard via a participatory hearing.

As the landlord was not successful in this application, I find that the landlord is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

### Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession, based on the January 10, 2018 Notice, without leave to reapply.

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: January 29, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch