



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 landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlords submitted two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on February 1, 2018, the landlords sent each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants will be deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 6, 2018, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenants on June 30, 1997, indicating a monthly rent of

\$950.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on September 1, 1997;

- A copy of a letter from the District of Saanich dated August 1, 2017 and addressed to landlords who are not the applicant;
- Eight copies of Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$950.00 to the current monthly rent amount of \$1,238.64;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated January 2, 2018 for \$1,238.64 in unpaid rent (the 10 Day Notice). The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 15, 2018;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 6:30 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 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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the landlords' names on the residential tenancy agreement do not match the landlords' names on the Application for Dispute Resolution. There is also no documentation referring to the transfer of responsibilities from the landlords named on the residential tenancy agreement to the landlords applying for dispute resolution.

As the Direct Request Process does not allow for clarification of the facts, I find that I am not able to determine whether the applicants are entitled to any orders resulting from this tenancy.

For this reason, the landlords' application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the landlords were not successful in this application, I find that the landlords are not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlords' 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: February 02, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch