



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-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 for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

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.

In this type of matter, the landlords must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per section 89 of the *Act*. Policy Guideline #39 on Direct Requests provides the following requirements:

“After the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding Package has been served to the tenant(s), the landlord must complete and submit to the Residential Tenancy Branch a Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding (form RTB-44) for each tenant served.”

I note that the landlords have not provided a copy of the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form to establish service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents to the tenant.

In its place, I find the landlords submitted a second copy of a photograph showing a 10 Day Notice attached to a door.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenant and for this reason, the landlords' application for an Order of Possession for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the landlords were not successful in this application, I find that the landlords are not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlords' application for an Order of Possession for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlords' application to recover the 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: December 16, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch