



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding PCPM LTD AS AGENT FOR COUNTESS GARDENS INC
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR

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 December 28, 2018, the landlord posted the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service. Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with sections 89(2) and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on December 31, 2018, the third day after their posting.

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*?

Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord who is not the applicant and the tenant on August 31, 2011, indicating a monthly rent of \$760.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on September 1, 2011;

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 5, 2018, for \$865.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenant had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the stated effective vacancy date of December 18, 2018;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 11:00 am on December 5, 2018; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the landlord's name on the tenancy agreement does not match the landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution, 10 Day Notice or any of the other documentation that has been submitted with the Application for Dispute Resolution.

As this is an *ex parte* proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, I have to be satisfied with the documentation presented. The discrepancy in the landlord's name raises a question that cannot be addressed through a Direct Request Proceeding.

For this reason the landlord's application for an Order of Possession for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order for Possession for unpaid rent with 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: January 03, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch