



# 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 copy of a Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm a package was sent to the tenant on December 2, 2018.

### 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*?

### 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 material does not lend itself to ambiguity or give rise to issues that may need 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 landlords 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 landlords have not provided a copy of a Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which would include a landlord statement establishing service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents to the tenant. In its place, I find that the landlords submitted an incomplete copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form that does not identify what documents were served or on which date service was completed.

Without the landlord statement in the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form, I find that I am not able to confirm what documents were included in the registered mailing sent on December 2, 2018.

I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenant, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process, and for this reason the landlords' application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed 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 and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent 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: December 19, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch