

Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding ROCK BAY APARTMENTS LTD and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

<u>Dispute Codes</u> 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 March 5, 2019, the landlord served the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding.

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*?

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*.

Page: 2

On the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, I find that the landlord has not indicated how the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding was served to the tenant.

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, and 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: March 11, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch