



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Century 21 Energy Realty
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, 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 for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The applicant submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on February 25, 2021, the applicant posted the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the door of the rental unit. The applicant had a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to confirm this service.

Issue(s) to be Decided

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

Is the applicant entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

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

Background and Evidence

The applicant submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which names a landlord who is not the applicant and was signed by the tenant on July 5, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$900.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on July 5, 2017
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated December 4, 2020, for \$3,340.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides

that the tenant had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the stated effective vacancy date of December 17, 2020

- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 2:10 (am or pm not indicated) on December 4, 2020
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy

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.

Policy Guideline #39 on Direct Requests provides the following information:

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

- The written tenancy agreement
- Documents showing changes to the tenancy agreement or tenancy, such as rent increases, or changes to parties or their agents
- 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 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (this is often considered proof that the tenant did not pay rent); and
- Proof that the landlord served the tenant with the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities and, if applicable, the Written Demand to Pay Utilities

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the landlord's name on the tenancy agreement does not match the landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution that the management company has changed; however, I find there is no evidence (such as a property management agreement or letter of introduction to the tenant) to demonstrate that the applicant is the current landlord and is 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 have to 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 applicant's request for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the applicant was not successful in this application, I find that the applicant is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the applicant's request for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the applicant's request 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: March 16, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch