



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding CASCADIA APARTMENT RENTALS
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 landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on July 25, 2019, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing.

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*?

Analysis

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* which permits service by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides or, by sending a copy by registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant.

I find that the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form indicates that the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents were sent to the tenant's rental unit. However; I find that the address written on the Canada Post Customer Receipt

shows the documents were sent to a different unit number that is not the rental address established in the tenancy agreement.

I find I am not able to confirm which unit number was used for the registered mailing of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding.

As I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenant, which is a requirement of the Direct Request Process, the landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

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 and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's 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: July 29, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch