



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## 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 form which declares that on October 03, 2019, the landlord’s agent served the respondent tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on October 08, 2019, the fifth day after their registered 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*?

## 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 residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant.

## 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.

“Policy Guideline #39. Direct Requests” provides the guidelines with respect to the Direct Request process. The guideline provides that the onus is on the landlord to ensure that they have included all required documents necessary for an application for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process. Policy Guideline #39 establishes that the landlord must provide, when making an application for dispute resolution, a copy of

the tenancy agreement. Section 13 of the *Act* provides, in part, the following with respect to the requirements for tenancy agreements:

(2) A tenancy agreement must comply with any requirements prescribed in the regulations and must set out all of the following:

(b) the correct legal names of the landlord and tenant;

Within the Direct Request process, the tenancy agreement is considered to be a vital document which establishes the parties to the tenancy agreement, the correct address of the rental unit, and the details agreed upon by the parties to the agreement, such as the day in the month on which the rent is due.

I find that the evidentiary material provided by the landlord brings into question whether the correct tenant is identified on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request. The tenant listed on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request is an individual, who will be identified as bearing the initials "SS", and is different than the individual listed as the tenant on the tenancy agreement, as the individual listed as the tenant on the tenancy agreement bears a different surname than the individual listed as the respondent tenant on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request.

The tenant listed on the tenancy agreement is an individual who bears the same first name as the respondent tenant on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, but bears a different surname than that the respondent identified on the application.

The tenancy agreement does not provide that the individual listed on the Application for Dispute Resolution entered into a tenancy agreement with the landlord, as the same complete legal name of the individual identified as the respondent tenant on the application does not appear on the tenancy agreement. The landlord has not provided any evidentiary material to demonstrate why the individual listed on the Application for Dispute Resolution bears a different surname than the person listed as the tenant on the tenancy agreement, or whether the two individuals are the same person.

I find that the landlord has not demonstrated that the respondent listed on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request entered into a tenancy agreement with the landlord. Based on the foregoing, I am unable to proceed with this application against the respondent party "SS" identified on the Application for Dispute Resolution.

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 tenant is correctly identified on both the application form 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 landlord's application for an Order of Possession and 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, and the requirements for service of documents, as prescribed in Section 89 of the *Act*, 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.

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 with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's request to recover the \$100.00 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: October 10, 2019

---

Residential Tenancy Branch