

# **Dispute Resolution Services**

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 February 29, 2018, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing in fact took place on January 29, 2018. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant will be deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on February 3, 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:

- A copy of the first page of a residential tenancy agreement indicating a monthly rent of \$775.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on April 1, 2017;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent dated December 15, 2017 for \$1,550.00 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 December 31, 2017;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 4:00 pm on December 15, 2017; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

## <u>Analysis</u>

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.

Section 59 of the *Act* establishes that an Application for Dispute Resolution must "include the full particulars of the dispute that is to be the subject of the dispute resolution proceedings." Paragraph 12 (1) (b) of the Residential Tenancy Regulations establishes that a tenancy agreement is required to "be signed and dated by both the landlord and the tenant."

I find that the landlord has not submitted a complete tenancy agreement and that the page containing the landlord and tenant signatures is not present. I further find that I am not able to consider the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution without this complete document which forms a part of the Application.

For this reason, the landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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 and 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: February 02, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch