



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

INTERIM 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 August 8, 2019, the landlord personally served Tenant A.C. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. The landlord had Tenant A.C. and a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(1) of the *Act*, I find that Tenant A.C. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on August 8, 2019.

The landlord submitted a second signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on August 8, 2019, the landlord served Tenant S.B. the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by handing the documents to Tenant A.C. The landlord had Tenant A.C. and a witness sign the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm personal service. Based on the written submission of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(2) of the *Act*, I find that Tenant S.B. has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on August 8, 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

The landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement indicating a monthly rent of \$1,600.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on April 1, 2018;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 30, 2019, for \$720.00 in unpaid rent owing for June 2019, \$1,600.00 in unpaid rent owing for July 2019, and \$250.00 in unpaid utilities. 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 August 10, 2019;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which was signed by Tenant A.C. and indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 8:55 pm on July 30, 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.

Paragraph 13(2)(b) of the *Act* establishes that a tenancy agreement is required to identify “the correct legal names of the landlord and tenant.”

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that Tenant S.B.’s name does not appear on the tenancy agreement. I also find that the tenancy agreement indicates a shortened version of Tenant A.C.’s name, and not the full name as it appears on either the 10 Day Notice or the Application for Dispute Resolution.

The discrepancies listed above raises questions that can only be addressed in a participatory hearing.

Conclusion

I order that the direct request proceeding be reconvened in accordance with section 74 of the *Act*. I find that a participatory hearing to be conducted by an arbitrator appointed under the *Act* is required in order to determine the details of the landlord's application.

Notices of Reconvened Hearing are enclosed with this interim decision. The applicant must serve the Notice of Reconvened Hearing, the interim decision, and all other required documents, upon each of the tenants within three (3) days of receiving this decision in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*.

Each party must serve the other and the Residential Tenancy Branch with any evidence that they intend to reply upon at the new hearing. Fact sheets are available at <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/residential-tenancies/information-sheets/rtb114.pdf> that explain evidence and service requirements.

For more information see our website at: gov.bc.ca/landlordtenant. If either party has any questions they may contact an Information Officer with the Residential Tenancy Branch at:

Lower Mainland: 604-660-1020

Victoria: 250-387-1602

Elsewhere in BC: 1-800-665-8779

This interim 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: August 09, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch