



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding MCARTHUR VILLA APARTMENTS
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

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 form which declares that on April 12, 2018, the landlord’s agent “CL” served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by signing the Proof of Service form. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by “BL” and a signature for “BL” is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 12, 2018.

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 Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding served to the tenant;
- A copy of an incomplete residential tenancy agreement, indicating a monthly rent of \$850.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on May 31, 2015;
- 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 April 02, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice showing that the landlord's agent "CL" served the Notice to the tenant by way of personal service via hand-delivery on April 02, 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 landlord 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.

“Policy Guideline #39. Direct Requests” provides the guidelines which govern the Direct Request process. The guideline provides that the onus is on the landlord to ensure that they have included all required documents necessary for an application for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process. Policy Guideline #39 establishes that the landlord must provide, when making an application for dispute resolution, a copy of the tenancy agreement. Section 13 of the *Act* provides, in part, the following with respect to the requirements for tenancy agreements:

(2) A tenancy agreement must comply with any requirements prescribed in the regulations and must set out all of the following:

(c) the address of the rental unit;

Within the Direct Request process, the tenancy agreement is considered to be a vital document which establishes the parties to the tenancy agreement, the correct address of the rental unit, and the details agreed upon by the parties to the agreement, such as the day in the month on which the rent is due. The manner in which the copy of the tenancy agreement provided by the landlord is drafted demonstrates that it does not fulfill the requirements as set out in section 13 of the *Act*, as it does not include the address of the rental unit.

The address of the rental unit is not indicated in any of the pages of the tenancy agreement included as part of this application.

I further find that the applicant has provided a copy of the tenancy agreement which may not be complete, as it appears to be missing pages. The copy of the tenancy agreement included as part of this application does not include the complete list of numbered items and terms, as it skips from item 19 to item 33. The first page of the tenancy agreement states that the tenancy agreement contains four pages; however, the tenancy agreement provided as part of this application contains only three of the four pages of the tenancy agreement.

I find that the landlord's application contains a deficiency, as the landlord has provided an incomplete tenancy agreement, and one that does not identify the address of the rental unit. As the tenancy agreement does not adhere to the criteria set out for tenancy agreements under the *Act* and the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*, I find that the landlord's application contains a deficiency which does not permit me to consider this application for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process.

As previously indicated, in an ex parte Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the applicant 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. I find that there are deficiencies with this application, as outlined above, which cannot be

clarified by way of the Direct Request Proceeding. These deficiencies cannot be remedied by inferences in the absence of more evidentiary material, or oral testimony, which may clarify the questions raised by these inconsistencies.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession 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, 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.

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 for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's request to recover the \$100.00 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: April 17, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch