



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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on January 17, 2018, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenant and a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on January 17, 2018.

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 was signed by the landlord and the tenant on November 22, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,500.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on December 1, 2017;

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated January 2, 2018 for \$1,500.00 in unpaid rent and \$150.00 in unpaid utilities (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 January 12, 2018;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was placed under the tenant's door at 6:00 pm on January 2, 2018; and
- A Direct Request 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 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 under the door of the rental unit. For this reason, 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 January 2, 2018, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of January 2, 2018, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

For the same reason listed above, I dismiss the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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.

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

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession on the basis of the 10 Day Notice of January 2, 2018 is dismissed, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of January 2, 2018 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 for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application without 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 18, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch