

Dispute Resolution Services

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 landlords (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 September 20, 2019, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of personal service via handdelivery. The personal service was confirmed as the tenant acknowledged receipt of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by signing the Proof of Service form. The Proof of Service form also establishes that the service was witnessed by "DB" and a signature for "DB" is included on the form.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been duly served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 20, 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*?

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, in part, the following evidentiary material:

• A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated September 05, 2019, which does not include an effective date.

<u>Analysis</u>

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.

Section 52 of the *Act* provides the following requirements regarding the form and content of notices to end tenancy:

52 In order to be effective, a notice to end a tenancy must be in writing and must

(a) be signed and dated by the landlord or tenant giving the notice,

- (b) give the address of the rental unit,
- (c) state the effective date of the notice,...and
- (e) when given by a landlord, be in the approved form...

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and find that the Notice, dated September 05, 2019, which was served to the tenant does not adhere to the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. The Notice does not include the effective date (the day when the tenant must move out of or vacate the site) of the Notice, therefore making the Notice incomplete. I find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not complied with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. It is possible to amend an incorrect date on the 10 Day Notice, but the *Act* does not allow an adjudicator to input a date where none is written on the Notice.

In a participatory hearing it may be possible to amend certain deficiencies with respect to the Notice or to seek clarification from the parties, however, in the limited scope of the Direct Request process, the *Act* does not allow an adjudicator to input an effective date of the notice where none is provided on the Notice. Therefore, I find that the September 05, 2019 Notice is not in compliance with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act* and is set aside and is of no force and effect.

As the landlord's application for an Order of Possession arises from a Notice that has been set aside, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession, based on the September 05, 2019 Notice, without leave to reapply.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlord's application for 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.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession, based on the September 05, 2019 Notice, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of September 05, 2019, is cancelled and of no force or effect.

This tenancy continues until it is ended in accordance with the Act.

I dismiss the landlord'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: October 02, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch