



# 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 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 September 22, 2018, the landlord 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.

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 September 22, 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 a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant;
- 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 September 16, 2018, which the landlord states was served to the tenant on September 16, 2018, for \$1,270.00 in unpaid rent due on September 01, 2018, with a stated effective vacancy date of September 26, 2018; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice form asserting that the landlord served the Notice to the tenant by way of personal service via hand-delivery on September 16, 2018. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant acknowledged receipt of the Notice by signing the Proof of Service form.

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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and find that in accordance with section 88 of the *Act* the tenant was duly served with the Notice on September 16, 2018.

Section 46 of the *Act* provides, in part, the following with respect to a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent:

**46** (4) Within 5 days after receiving a notice under this section, the tenant may

- (a) pay the overdue rent, in which case the notice has no effect, or
- (b) dispute the notice by making an application for dispute resolution.

Section 55(2) of the *Act* provides, in part, the following with respect to a landlord's ability to request an order of possession of a rental unit:

**Order of possession for the landlord**

**55** (2) A landlord may request an order of possession of a rental unit in any of the following circumstances by making an application for dispute resolution:

- (b) a notice to end the tenancy has been given by the landlord, the tenant has not disputed the notice by making an application for dispute resolution and the time for making that application has expired;

I find that, as the tenant received the Notice on September 16, 2018, the tenant's latest opportunity to either pay, in full, the amount listed on the Notice, or to file for dispute resolution to dispute the Notice, would have been September 21, 2018. By extension then, in accordance with the provisions of subsection 55(2)(b) of the *Act*, the landlord's earliest opportunity to apply for an Order of Possession would therefore have been on September 22, 2018.

I find that the landlord has filed an application for an Order of Possession and a monetary Order via dispute resolution by Direct Request earlier than permitted by the *Act*, as the landlord filed an "Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request" on September 21, 2018, which, along with the application filing fee, was established as being received by the Residential Tenancy Branch on September 21, 2018.

I further find that the landlord has not provided any evidentiary material to demonstrate that the tenant received the Notice, dated September 16, 2018, earlier than September 16, 2018. Based on the foregoing, the landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a monetary Order based on 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 applicant's application for an Order of Possession with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the applicant's application for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the applicant'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: September 26, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch