



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding COAST PACIFIC PROPERTY SERVICES LTD.  
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 05, 2018, the landlord’s agent served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord 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.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, 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 April 10, 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 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 landlord's agent and the tenant on May 15, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$600.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 01, 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 March 03, 2018; and

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 landlords 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 documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Residential Tenancy Policy Guideline # 39 contains the details about the key elements that need to be considered when making an application for Direct Request. Policy Guideline # 39 directs that, as part of the application, a landlord must include proof that the landlord served the tenant with the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent. Policy Guideline 39 describes that the applicant must include a completed "Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy" form to demonstrate that the Notice to End Tenancy was served to the tenant in a manner permitted under the *Act*. Policy Guideline 39 provides, in part, the following:

### C. PROOF OF SERVICE

#### C.1. 10 DAY NOTICE TO END TENANCY

The landlord must prove the tenant was served with the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (form RTB-30). A Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy and Written Demand to Pay Utilities (form RTB-34) can be used for this purpose.

Because the tenant does not have an opportunity to present evidence on the issues in a direct request proceeding, it is essential that the landlord provide substantive proof of service.

While a landlord may use any method of service allowed under the Legislation to serve the tenant with a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities, if the landlord cannot provide clear proof of service, the director's delegate ("the director") may dismiss the application with or without leave to reapply or adjourn it to be reconvened as a participatory hearing.

As part of an application for dispute resolution by Direct Request, a landlord must provide a Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form to prove that the Notice to End Tenancy was served in accordance with the Act. I find that the landlord has not provided a Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form to prove that the Notice to End Tenancy was served to the tenant in accordance with the Act as attested in the application.

The landlord has provided copies of a Canada Post registered mail ticket and transaction receipt, however, the landlord has not provided any additional evidentiary material to demonstrate the contents of the registered mail item. The landlord has not proven, by signed attestation on a Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form, that the registered mail item contained a copy of the March 03, 2018 Notice to End Tenancy.

I find that the copies of the Canada Post registered mail ticket and transaction receipt provided by the landlord do not sufficiently prove that the Notice to End Tenancy was served in accordance with the Act.

Notwithstanding the landlord's effort to prove service of the Notice to End Tenancy by providing copies of the Canada Post registered mail ticket and transaction receipt, I find that the landlord is still required to provide a completed Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form, which includes the name and signature of the person attesting to having served the Notice to End Tenancy, to prove that the Notice was served in accordance with the Act.

I find that the landlord has not demonstrated that the Notice to End Tenancy was served in accordance with the Act, nor has the landlord provided a completed Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form, as required under the provisions of the Direct Request process outlined in Policy Guideline #39. Based on the evidentiary material provided by the landlord, I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notice to End Tenancy to the tenant, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process.

I further find that there is no evidence before me that establishes that the landlord was given leave to serve the Notice to End Tenancy in an alternative fashion as ordered by a delegate of the director of the Residential Tenancy Branch in accordance with section 88(i) of the Act.

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 landlord's 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 11, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch