



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-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 for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent.

The landlords submitted two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on March 20, 2020, the landlords sent each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenants are deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on March 25, 2020, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which names a landlord who is not one of the applicants and was signed by the tenants on February 13, 2013, indicating a monthly rent of \$700.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on March 1, 2013;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$750.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$768.00;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 2, 2020, for \$786.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for

Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the stated effective vacancy date of March 15, 2020;

- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenants' door at 12:23 pm on March 2, 2020; and
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

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 that such evidentiary material 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.

Policy Guideline #39 on Direct Requests provides the following information:

When making an application for dispute resolution through the direct request process, the landlord must provide copies of:

- The written tenancy agreement;
- Documents showing changes to the tenancy agreement or tenancy, such as rent increases, or **changes to parties or their agents**;
- The Direct Request Worksheet (form RTB-46) setting out the amount of rent or utilities owing which may be accompanied by supporting documents such as a rent ledger or receipt book;
- The 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (this is often considered proof that the tenant did not pay rent); and,
- Proof that the landlord served the tenant with the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities and, if applicable, the Written Demand to Pay Utilities.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the landlord's name on the tenancy agreement does not match either of the landlords' names on the Application for Dispute Resolution. There is also no evidence or documentation showing that the applicants are the owners of the rental property or are otherwise entitled to any orders that may result from this application.

As this is an *ex parte* proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, I have to be satisfied with the documentation presented. The discrepancy in the landlord's name raises a question that cannot be addressed in a Direct Request Proceeding.

For this reason, the landlords' application for an Order of Possession for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

his 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: March 30, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch