



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## DECISION

Dispute Codes      OPRM-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 Applicant for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The Applicant submitted two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on June 06, 2019, the Applicant served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of posting a copy for each tenant to the door of the rental unit. The Proof of Service forms establish that the service was witnessed by an individual bearing the initials “MW” and a signature for “MW” is included on the forms.

Based on the written submissions of the Applicant, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on June 09, 2019, three days after their posting.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the Applicant entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the Applicant entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 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 Applicant submitted, in part, the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which listed the landlord as being an entity bearing the initials “PHL”;

### 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 landlord 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.

The Direct Request process is a mechanism that allows a landlord to apply for an expedited decision, and as such, the landlord must follow and submit documentation exactly as prescribed by the *Act* and Policy Guideline #39 – Direct Requests. There can be no omissions or deficiencies with items being left open to interpretation or inference. Under the provisions of Policy Guideline #39 – Direct Requests, when making an application for dispute resolution through the direct request process, the landlord must provide copies of documents showing changes to the tenancy agreement or tenancy, such as rent increases, or **changes to parties or their agents** [emphasis added].

I find that the evidentiary material provided by the Applicant brings into question whether the correct landlord is identified on the application for dispute resolution. The landlord listed on the application for dispute resolution is an individual, who will be identified as bearing the initials “EC”, and is different than the entity listed as the landlord on the tenancy agreement. The landlord listed on the tenancy agreement is an entity, which, for the purpose of this decision, will be identified as bearing the initials “PHL”.

The tenancy agreement demonstrates that “PHL” was listed on the tenancy agreement as the landlord, and that “PHL” endorsed the terms of the tenancy agreement to enter into a tenancy agreement with the tenants identified on the tenancy agreement and on the application for dispute resolution.

I find that the Applicant has not demonstrated whether the landlord listed on the application form, “EC”, inherited the tenancy agreement from the landlord listed on the tenancy agreement, or whether the Applicant “EC” has authorization to act as an agent for the landlord listed on the tenancy agreement. I further find that the Applicant “EC” has not demonstrated that he entered into a tenancy agreement with the individuals identified as the respondent tenants on the application for dispute resolution.

I also find that the Applicant “EC” has not provided any documentary evidence to show whether he is the owner of the residential property which comprises the rental unit, and whether he may have entered into an agency or property management agreement with “PHL” in which he may have authorized “PHL” to act as his agent in the capacity of landlord with respect to the tenancy.

As previously indicated, in an ex parte Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the Applicant 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 that cannot be clarified by way of the Direct Request Proceeding, as the application before me brings into question whether the landlord is correctly identified on both the application for dispute resolution and on the tenancy agreement. 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 applicant’s application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary order with leave to reapply.

It remains open to the applicant 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 applicant may wish to submit an application for dispute resolution to be heard via a participatory hearing.

### Conclusion

I dismiss the applicant’s application for an Order of Possession with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the applicant’s application for a monetary Order 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: June 07, 2019

---

Residential Tenancy Branch