



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPU-DR, OPUM-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 Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on September 16, 2020, the landlord sent each of the tenants the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of two UPS Store parcel shipping orders and receipts to confirm these mailings.

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*?

Analysis

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per section 89 of the *Act* which permits service “by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides...”

The definition of registered mail is set out in section 1 of the *Act* as “any method of mail delivery provided by Canada Post for which confirmation of delivery to a named person is available.”

I find that the landlord sent the Notices of Direct Request to the tenants through UPS and not a service provided by Canada Post. As such, I find the mailings do not meet the definition of registered mail as defined under the *Act*.

Since I find that the landlord has not served the tenants with notice of this application in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for 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

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application is dismissed 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: September 21, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch