



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-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.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on October 6, 2018, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had the tenant sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service.

The landlord also submitted a copy of a Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm a package was sent to the tenant on October 24, 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 recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

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.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per section 89 of the *Act*.

I find that the landlord submitted their Application for Dispute Resolution on October 18, 2018. On the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the landlord has indicated they personally served the Notice of Direct Request to the tenant on October 6, 2018, before the day the landlord filed their application.

The landlord has also submitted a copy of a Canada Post Customer Receipt to confirm a package was sent to the tenant on October 24, 2018; however, I find the landlord has not submitted a statement indicating what documents were included in this registered mailing.

Due to the discrepancies listed above, I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request to the tenant, which is a requirement of the Direct Request Process.

Therefore, the landlord's application for an Order of Possession 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 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: October 29, 2018

Residential Tenancy Branch