



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 48(4) of the *Manufactured Home Park 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 form which contends that on December 29, 2017, the landlord “CS” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 39 and 48 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 60 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 65 of the *Act*?

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 landlord 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.

I have reviewed all relevant documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Section 82 of the *Act* provides the approved methods by which an application for dispute resolution can be served. Section 82 provides, in part, as follows:

Special rules for certain documents

82 (1) An application for dispute resolution or a decision of the director to proceed with a review under Division 2 of Part 6, when required to be given to one party by another, must be given in one of the following ways:

- (a) by leaving a copy with the person;
- (c) by sending a copy by 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;
- (e) as ordered by the director under section 64 (1) *[director's orders: delivery and service of documents]*.

(2) An application by a landlord under section 48 *[order of possession for the landlord]*, 49 *[application for order ending tenancy early]* or 49.1 *[order of possession: tenancy frustrated]* must be given to the tenant in one of the following ways:

- (a) by leaving a copy with the tenant;
- (b) by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the tenant resides;
- (c) by leaving a copy at the tenant's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant;
- (d) by attaching a copy to a door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the tenant resides;
- (e) as ordered by the director under section 64 (1) *[director's orders: delivery and service of documents]*.

In the Direct Request process, 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 subsections 82(1) and (2) of the *Act*, which permit service “by sending a copy by 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.” The definition of registered mail is set out in section 1 of the *Act* as “any method of mail delivery provided by Canada Post for which confirmation of delivery to a named person is available.”

On the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form, the landlord has indicated that the tenant was served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents by way of registered mail. If service of the Direct Request Proceeding documents is carried out in this manner, the landlord must provide evidentiary material, in the form of a Canada Post Registered Mail receipt or ticket which includes the tracking number, as well as the name of the person to whom the registered mail item was addressed, as proof of service via registered mail.

The landlord has not provided any documentary evidence, such as a Canada Post customer receipt or registered mail ticket containing the tracking number, to confirm the mailing and to demonstrate that the tenant was served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents by way registered mail.

I find that there is no evidentiary material before me to prove that the landlord served the Direct Request Proceeding documents by way of registered mail. The landlord has not provided a Canada Post Registered Mail receipt, and furthermore, the landlord has not included the name and signature of a witness on the Proof of Service form to confirm that service of the documents was carried out by way of registered mail. Therefore, I find that I cannot confirm that the tenant has been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents in accordance with the *Act*.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the landlord has not proven service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents containing a copy of the application for dispute resolution in accordance with the *Act*. Therefore, I dismiss the landlord’s application for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and 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, and the requirements for service of documents, as prescribed in Section 82 of the *Act*, 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.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application 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 *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act*.

Dated: January 08, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch