



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **INTERIM 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 two signed Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding which declare that on April 1, 2020, the landlord personally served each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding.

Section 9 of the *Ministerial Order M089* issued March 30, 2020, pursuant to the State of Emergency declared on March 18, 2020 states that a person must not give or serve any document by leaving a copy of the document with a person.

However, section 71(2)(c) of the *Act* enables me to make an order that a document not served in accordance with the legislation is sufficiently given or served for purposes of this *Act*.

The landlord had the tenants and a witness sign the Proofs of Service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm service of the documents. For this reason, I am satisfied that the tenants received the Direct Request Proceeding documents.

In accordance with section 71(2)(c) of the *Act*, I find that the tenants have been served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding on April 1, 2020, the day they signed the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms.

### 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

The landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the tenants on November 1, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$750.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 1, 2019;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 4, 2020, for \$750.00 in unpaid rent and \$200.00 in unpaid utilities. 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 14, 2020;
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 11:15 am on March 4, 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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the landlord's name on the tenancy agreement is a business and as such, it does not match the individual landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution. There is also no evidence or documentation showing that the applicant is the owner of the business or is 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, I find that a participatory hearing is necessary to address this issue.

### Conclusion

I order that the direct request proceeding be reconvened in accordance with section 74 of the *Act*. I find that a participatory hearing to be conducted by an arbitrator appointed under the *Act* is required in order to determine the details of the landlord's application.

**Notices of Reconvened Hearing are enclosed with this interim decision. The applicant must serve the Notice of Reconvened Hearing, the interim decision, and all other required documents, upon each of the tenants within three (3) days of receiving this decision in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*.**

Each party must serve the other and the Residential Tenancy Branch with any evidence that they intend to reply upon at the new hearing. Fact sheets are available at <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/residential-tenancies/information-sheets/rtb114.pdf> that explain evidence and service requirements.

For more information see our website at: [gov.bc.ca/landlordtenant](http://gov.bc.ca/landlordtenant). If either party has any questions they may contact an Information Officer with the Residential Tenancy Branch at:

**Lower Mainland:** 604-660-1020

**Victoria:** 250-387-1602

**Elsewhere in BC:** 1-800-665-8779

This interim 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: April 14, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch