## **Dispute Resolution Services**

Residential Tenancy Branch Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, OPRM-DR

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 filed by the Landlord for an order of possession and a monetary order based on unpaid rent.

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.

Policy Guideline #39 confirms that a landlord making an application for dispute resolution through the Direct Request process must provide specific documentation in support, including documentation showing changes to the tenancy agreement or tenancy, such as rent increases, or changes to parties or their agents.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the Landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution does not match the landlord's name on the tenancy agreement. There is also no evidence or documentation showing that the applicant is the owner of the rental property or is otherwise entitled to any orders that may result from this application.

As this is an *ex parte* proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, I must be satisfied with the documentation presented. The discrepancy in the landlord's name raises a question that cannot be addressed in a Direct Request Proceeding.

For this reason, the Landlord's requests for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent is dismissed with 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: March 11, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch