



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

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

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 20, 2021, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by e-mail. The landlord provided a copy of the outgoing e-mail containing attachments of the supporting documents to confirm this service.

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

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 on the Notice as per section 89 of the *Act*.

Section 89 of the *Act* provides that a Notice of Direct Request Proceeding may be served “*by any other means of service provided for in the regulations.*”

On March 1, 2021, section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation* was created to provide that documents “*may be given to a person by emailing a copy to an email address provided as an address for service by the person.*”

I find that the landlord has served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenant by e-mail. The landlord submitted a copy of a tenancy agreement containing the tenant's e-mail address; however, I find the tenancy agreement does not specifically indicate that official documents can be served by e-mail.

Furthermore, I find the tenancy agreement was signed on February 23, 2017. As the regulation did not come into effect until March 1, 2021, I find the tenant cannot have consented to use a method of service in accordance with a regulation that did not yet exist.

I find the landlord has not demonstrated that the tenant's e-mail address was provided for service of documents, as required by section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*.

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

As the landlord was not successful in this application, I find the landlord is not entitled to recover the filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

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

I dismiss the landlord's 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: May 05, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch