



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 landlords (the “landlord”) for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The landlord submitted two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on December 24, 2019, the landlord’s agent “DS” served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of posting a copy for each tenant to the door of the rental unit. The Proof of Service forms establish that the service was witnessed by an individual bearing the initials “GS” and a signature for “GS” is included on the forms.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on December 27, 2019, three days after their posting.

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 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the Notice) dated December 03, 2019, for \$800.00 in unpaid rent due on December 01, 2019, with a stated effective vacancy date of December 13, 2019.

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.

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 relevant documentary evidence provided by the landlord and find that the Notice, dated December 03, 2019, served to the tenants does not adhere to the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*. The Notice is not signed by the landlord, or by an agent of the landlord, thereby making the Notice incomplete. I find that this omission invalidates the 10 Day Notice as the landlord has not provided a signature on the Notice served to the tenants, in accordance with the provisions of section 52 of the *Act*.

Therefore, I find that the December 03, 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 is based on a Notice that has been set aside, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession, based on the December 03, 2019 Notice, without leave to reapply.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order 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, based on the December 03, 2019 Notice, without leave to reapply.

The 10 Day Notice of December 03, 2019 is cancelled and is of no force and 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.

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: December 31, 2019

Residential Tenancy Branch