



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 a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 23, 2018, the landlord “HD” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “AS” and a signature for “AS” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlords, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 28, 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 the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords and the tenant on November 16, 2016, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,250.00 due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on December 01, 2016;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing during the portion of this tenancy in question;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated March 08, 2018, which the landlords state was served to the tenant on March 08, 2018, for \$3,000.00 in unpaid rent due on March 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of March 18, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice asserting that the landlords served the Notice to the tenant by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit on March 08, 2018.

The Notice restates section 46(4) of the Act which provides that the tenant had five days to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the effective date of the Notice. The tenant did not apply to dispute the Notice within five days from the date of service and the landlords alleged that the tenant did not pay the rental arrears.

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.

Section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

52 In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must

- (a) be signed and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,
- (b) give the address of the rental unit,
- (c) state the effective date of the notice,...and
- (e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlords and find that the Notice, dated March 08, 2018, served to the tenant does not adhere to the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. The Notice is not signed by the landlord, thereby making the Notice incomplete. I find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not provided a signature on the Notice served to the tenant, in accordance with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I find that the March 08, 2018 Notice is not in compliance with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act* and is set aside and is of no force and effect.

As the landlords' application for an Order of Possession arises from a Notice that has been set aside, I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession, based on the March 08, 2018 Notice, without leave to reapply.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlords' application for a monetary Order 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, based on the March 08, 2018 Notice, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of March 08, 2018 is cancelled and of no force or effect.

This tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the *Act*.

I dismiss the landlords' application for a monetary Order 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: March 28, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch