



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes   OPR-DR, OPRM-DR, FFL

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 and a monetary order based on unpaid rent, and an order granting recovery of the filing fee.

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 landlord must prove they served the tenant with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated as per section 89 of the *Act*.

With respect to proving service of the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding package, Policy Guideline #39 states:

*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. The landlord may prove service of one of these methods of service as described in the table above.*

The language in the Policy Guideline #39 is mandatory.

In this case, I find that the Landlord has not provided a copy of a Proof of Service - Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to establish service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents on the Tenants. As a result, I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding on the Tenants, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process. For this reason, the Landlord's application for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent or utilities is dismissed 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.

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: January 19, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch