



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR-PP, 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.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which declares that on August 23, 2020, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. 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 landlord, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant has been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on August 28, 2020, 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 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 provided an evidentiary material package which does not include a copy of the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent and a copy of the written tenancy agreement.

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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the landlord. Residential Tenancy Policy Guideline # 39 contains the details about the key elements that need to be considered when making an application for Direct Request. Policy Guideline # 39 directs that, as part of the application, a landlord must provide a copy of the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent and a copy of the written tenancy agreement.

On the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, the landlord contends that there is unpaid rent owed by the tenant, which forms the basis for the landlord's request for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent. The landlord has provided a copy of a Proof of Service of the Notice form, on which the landlord contends that a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy was served to the tenant.

However, within the Direct Request process, the landlord is obligated to provide proof that the tenant has not provided rent for the period specified on the Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, and, as outlined in Residential Tenancy Policy

Guideline # 39, the landlord must provide a copy of the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent for this purpose.

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.

By failing to provide a copy of the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent, and by failing to provide a copy of a written tenancy agreement, I find that the landlord has not provided a complete Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request in accordance with Policy Guideline # 39, and therefore, based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, 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 unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's 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: August 27, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch