



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPRM-DR, 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 landlords (the “landlord”) for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which declares that on September 30, 2020, the landlord served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by way of posting it to the door of the rental unit. The Proof of Service form establishes that the service was witnessed by “ST” and a signature for “ST” is included on the form.

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 October 03, 2020, three days after their posting.

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

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.

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.

The Direct Request process is a mechanism that allows a landlord to apply for an expedited decision, and as such, the landlord must follow and submit documentation exactly as prescribed by the *Act* and Policy Guideline #39 – Direct Requests. There can be no omissions or deficiencies with items being left open to interpretation or inference.

Section 59(2)(b) of the *Act* provides that an application for dispute resolution must provide the full particulars of the dispute that is to be the subject of the dispute resolution proceeding. I find that the landlord has not provided any particulars with respect to the details of the calculation of the amount being sought for unpaid rent, and with respect to the purported unpaid rent which underpins the landlord's request for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent.

Rather, the landlord has not provided any particulars to demonstrate how the amount of unpaid rent in the amount of \$2,334.00 was calculated. Therefore, I find that portion of the landlord's application does not comply with section 59(2)(b) of the *Act*.

Policy Guideline #39 provides, in part, the following:

B. ONUS ON THE LANDLORD

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

- *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 purpose of the Direct Request Worksheet (form RTB-46) is to provide a mechanism for applicants to provide complete details of the amount of unpaid rent purportedly owed with respect to the tenancy.

By not providing a copy of the Direct Request Worksheet (form RTB-46), I find that the landlord has not adhered to the requirements of a complete Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request as set out in Policy Guideline #39.

Additionally, as the landlord has failed to provide the full particulars of the dispute that is to be the subject of the dispute resolution proceeding by not providing the details of the unpaid rent purportedly owed with respect to the tenancy, I find that the landlord has not adhered to section 59(2)(b) of the *Act*, as the landlord has not provided any particulars with respect to the calculation of the rent claimed as being owed by the tenant.

As previously indicated, 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 narrow scope of a Direct Request Proceeding.

I find that there are deficiencies with this application, as outlined above, which cannot be clarified within the narrow scope of the Direct Request process. 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.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a monetary Order with leave to reapply.

It remains open to the landlord to reapply for dispute resolution via the Direct Request process if all requirements for an application for dispute resolution via Direct Request, as outlined in Policy Guideline #39, can be met, or, in the alternative, the landlord may wish to submit an application for dispute resolution to be heard via a participatory hearing.

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: October 15, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch