



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 applicants (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 December 20, 2019, the applicant served each of the above-named respondents with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The applicant provided two copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. 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 applicant, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the respondents have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on December 25, 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 applicant submitted, in part, the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which lists the landlord as being an individual bearing the initials “FC”;

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 landlords 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.

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 by Direct Request. The landlords listed on the Application for Dispute Resolution are individuals, who will be identified as bearing the initials "JL" and "MC" respectively, and are different than the individual listed as the landlord on the tenancy agreement. The landlord listed on the tenancy agreement is an individual, who, for the purpose of this decision, will be identified as bearing the initials "FC".

The tenancy agreement demonstrates that "FC" was listed on the tenancy agreement as the landlord, and that "FC" 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 applicants have not provided any evidentiary material to demonstrate whether the landlords listed on the application form, "JL" and "MC", inherited the tenancy agreement from the landlord listed on the tenancy agreement, or whether the applicants "JL" and "MC" have authorization to act as an agent for the landlord listed on the tenancy agreement. I further find that the applicants "JL" and "MC" have not demonstrated that they entered into a tenancy agreement with the individuals identified as the respondent tenants on the application for dispute resolution, and have not provided any evidentiary material to demonstrate whether they may have purchased and taken ownership of the premises which comprises the rental unit, and, by extension, that they inherited the tenancy agreement from the original landlord identified in the tenancy agreement.

As previously indicated, in an ex parte Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the applicant 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. I find that there are deficiencies with this application, as outlined above, which cannot be clarified by way of the Direct Request Proceeding. 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 applicants' application for an Order of Possession and monetary order with leave to reapply.

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

As the applicants were not successful in this application, I find that the applicants are not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the applicants' application for an Order of Possession with leave to reapply.

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

I dismiss the applicants' 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: December 30, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch