



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 landlords (the “landlord”) for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order.

The landlord submitted two signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on September 17, 2020 the landlord served each of the above-named tenants with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding via registered mail. The landlord provided two copies of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. 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 tenants have been deemed served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 22, 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 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

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.

On the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request, the landlord seeks an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent in the amount of \$2,100.00.

The landlord submitted, in part, the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which does not list the address of the rental unit.

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.

“Policy Guideline #39. Direct Requests” provides the guidelines with respect to the Direct Request process. The guideline provides that the onus is on the landlord to ensure that they have included all required documents necessary for an application for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process. Policy Guideline #39 establishes that the landlord must provide, when making an application for dispute resolution, a copy of the tenancy agreement. Section 13 of the *Act* provides, in part, the following with respect to the requirements for tenancy agreements:

(2) A tenancy agreement must comply with any requirements prescribed in the regulations and must set out all of the following:

(c) the address of the rental unit;

Within the Direct Request process, the tenancy agreement is considered to be a vital document which establishes the parties to the tenancy agreement, the correct address of the rental unit, and the details agreed upon by the parties to the agreement, such as the day in the month on which the rent is due. The manner in which the copy of the tenancy agreement provided by the landlord is drafted demonstrates that it does not fulfill the requirements as set out in section 13 of the *Act*, as it does not include the address of the rental unit.

The address of the rental unit is not indicated in any of the pages of the tenancy agreement included as part of this application.

I further find that the applicant has provided a copy of the tenancy agreement which is incomplete, as it appears to be missing pages. The copy of the tenancy agreement included as part of this application states that the tenancy agreement contains six pages, but is missing the first page on which the address of the rental unit is to be identified.

I find that the landlord’s application contains a deficiency, as the landlord has provided an incomplete tenancy agreement, and one that does not identify the address of the rental unit. As the tenancy agreement does not adhere to the criteria set out for tenancy agreements under the *Act* and the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*, I find that the landlord’s application contains a deficiency which does not permit me to consider this application for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process.

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. I find that there are deficiencies with this application, as outlined above, which cannot be clarified by way of the Direct Request Proceeding. These deficiencies cannot be remedied by inferences in the absence of more evidentiary material, or oral testimony, which may clarify the questions raised by these inconsistencies.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession and a monetary Order 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 with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application for a monetary Order 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: September 25, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch