



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding JJ FAMILY FARMS LTD and
[tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

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 two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on June 1, 2019, the landlords personally served each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlords had a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submissions of the landlords 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 June 1, 2019.

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*?

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 landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which names a landlord who is not one of the applicants and was signed by Tenant Ca.B. on July 8, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,250.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 12, 2015;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated May 10, 2019, for \$1,250.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 May 20, 2019;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 3:30 pm on May 10, 2019; 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 either of the landlords' names on the Application for Dispute Resolution. There is also no evidence or documentation showing that the

applicants are the owners of the rental property or are otherwise entitled to any orders that may result from this application.

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 in a Direct Request Proceeding.

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: June 03, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch