



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **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 by the landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlord submitted two signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on June 16, 2021, the landlord personally served each of the tenants the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request. The landlord had the tenants and a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms to confirm personal service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were duly served to the tenants on June 16, 2021.

### 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*?

### Background and Evidence

The landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the tenants, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,350.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 15, 2020

- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated May 20, 2021, for \$2,825.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 May 31, 2021
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was personally served to the tenants at 4:15 pm on May 20, 2021

### 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.

Section 59 of the *Act* establishes that an Application for Dispute Resolution must “include the full particulars of the dispute that is to be the subject of the dispute resolution proceedings.”

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.
- The 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities.
- 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 find that the landlord has not submitted a copy of a Direct Request Worksheet which is a requirement of the Direct Request process. I further find that I am not able to consider the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution without this document which forms a part of the Application.

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 \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order 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: June 21, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch