



# 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 two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on April 26, 2019, the landlord served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The Proof of Service forms establish that the service was witnessed by “SG” and a signature for “SG” is included on the forms.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 26, 2019.

### 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

I have reviewed all written submissions and evidence before me; however, only the evidence and submissions relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

The landlord submitted the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated April 08, 2019; and
- A copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice form asserting that the Notice was served to the tenants by way of personal service via hand-delivery on April 08, 2019. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “SP” and a signature for “SP” is included on the form.

## 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 landlords 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 provided by the applicant landlord. Residential Tenancy Policy Guideline # 39 contains the details about the key elements that need to be considered when making an application for Direct Request. Policy Guideline # 39 directs that, as part of the application, a landlord must include proof that the landlord served the tenant with the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent. Policy Guideline 39 describes that the applicant must include a completed “Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy” form to demonstrate that the Notice to End

Tenancy was served to the tenant in a manner permitted under the *Act*. Policy Guideline 39 provides, in part, the following:

### C. PROOF OF SERVICE

#### C.1. 10 DAY NOTICE TO END TENANCY

The landlord must prove the tenant was served with the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (form RTB-30). A Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy and Written Demand to Pay Utilities (form RTB-34) can be used for this purpose.

Because the tenant does not have an opportunity to present evidence on the issues in a direct request proceeding, it is essential that the landlord provide substantive proof of service.

While a landlord may use any method of service allowed under the Legislation to serve the tenant with a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities, if the landlord cannot provide clear proof of service, the director's delegate ("the director") may dismiss the application with or without leave to reapply or adjourn it to be reconvened as a participatory hearing.

On the Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form, the applicant landlord contends that he served the Notice to End Tenancy to the tenants by way of personal service via hand-delivery. The applicant contends that the service was witnessed by "SP" and a signature for "SP" is included on the Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form.

However, within the Direct Request process, the person serving the Notice to End Tenancy must provide a name and signature on the Proof of Service of the Notice form to End Tenancy form. The Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form serves to allow the person serving the Notice to End Tenancy to provide a written attestation to confirm service of the Notice.

I find that the Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form submitted by the applicant landlord shows that the person serving the Notice did not provide a name or signature on the second page of the form in the field where service of the Notice to End Tenancy is to be confirmed.

The person serving the Notice must provide their name and signature on the second page of the Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form, under the section titled "signature", as doing so permits the person to attest to having served the Notice in accordance with the *Act*, as detailed in the earlier sections of the Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form.

On the second page of the Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form, under the section titled "Witness Statement", the form does include the name and signature of

a witness bearing the initials "SP" to demonstrate that the service of the Notice was witnessed. However, I find that the landlord is required to provide a completed Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form which includes the name and signature of the person who asserts that the Notice to End Tenancy was served in accordance with the Act. I find that the Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form submitted by the landlord provides that the person who may have served the Notice did not provide a name and signature on the second page of the form in the field where service of the Notice to End Tenancy is to be confirmed.

I find that the landlord has not proven that service of the Notice to End Tenancy was completed in accordance with the Act, as the landlord has not provided a completed Proof of Service of the Notice to End Tenancy form which includes the name and signature of the person serving the Notice, as required under the provisions of the Direct Request process outlined in Policy Guideline #39. Based on the evidentiary material provided by the landlord, I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notice to End Tenancy to the tenants, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process.

As previously indicated, in an ex parte Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the applicant 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. I find that there are deficiencies with this application, as outlined above, which cannot be clarified by way of the Direct Request Proceeding. These deficiencies cannot be remedied by inferences in the absence of more evidentiary material, or oral testimony, which may clarify the questions raised by these inconsistencies.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

It remains open to the landlord to reapply for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process if all requirements for an application for dispute resolution via Direct Request, as outlined in Policy Guideline #39, can be met, or, in the alternative, the landlord may wish to submit an application for dispute resolution to be heard via a participatory hearing.

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 with leave to reapply.

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

I dismiss the landlord'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: April 29, 2019

---

Residential Tenancy Branch