



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-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.

The landlord has uploaded a file named "Proof of Service Direct Request Proceeding.pdf" with a file size of 0B. As this file has zero bytes, the document cannot be opened and considered in the evidence.

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 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 September 7, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$760.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on September 6, 2016;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated January 8, 2018 for \$1,720.00 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 January 20, 2018;

- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenant at 3:40 pm on January 8, 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 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 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*.

I note that the Proof of Service Direct Request Proceeding document submitted by the landlord is a file with zero bytes of content. Therefore, 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 for an Order of Possession is dismissed with leave to reapply.

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 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 29, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch