



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPRM-DR, FFL

### Introduction

Pursuant to section 58 of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (“Act”), I was designated to hear an application regarding the above-noted tenancy. The landlord applied for:

- an Order of Possession for unpaid rent, pursuant to section 55;
- a monetary order for unpaid rent, pursuant to section 67; and
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application, pursuant to section 72.

The two tenants did not attend this hearing, which lasted approximately 9 minutes. The landlord’s agent (“landlord”) attended the hearing and was given a full opportunity to be heard, to present affirmed testimony, to make submissions and to call witnesses. The landlord confirmed that he was representing the landlord company named in this application.

### Preliminary Issue – Direct Request Proceeding and Service

This hearing was originally scheduled as a direct request proceeding, which is a non-participatory hearing. The direct request proceeding is based on the landlord’s paper application only, not any submissions from the tenants. An “interim decision,” dated December 20, 2019, was issued by an Adjudicator for the direct request proceeding. The interim decision adjourned the direct request proceeding to this participatory hearing.

The landlord was required to serve the tenants with a copy of the interim decision, the notice of reconvened hearing and all other required documents, within three days of receiving it, as outlined in the interim decision itself.



The landlord said that he received the interim decision on December 20, 2019. He claimed that he sent the above documents by registered mail to the tenants. He was unable to provide dates of service or tracking numbers for the registered mail.

Accordingly, I find that the tenants were not served with the interim decision, notice of reconvened hearing and all other required documents, as per section 89 of the *Act*. The landlord did not provide dates or registered mail tracking numbers for service.

I notified the landlord that the landlord's application was dismissed with leave to reapply, except for the filing fee. The landlord is required to file a new application, pay another filing fee and provide proof of service at the next hearing, if the landlord chooses to pursue this matter further.

### Conclusion

The landlord's application to recover the \$100.00 filing fee is dismissed without leave to reapply.

The remainder of the landlord's application is dismissed 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: February 27, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch