



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding 1104719 BC Ltd  
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR-DR, MNR-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 to obtain an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, to obtain monetary compensation for unpaid rent, and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 2, 2021, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by e-mail. The landlord provided a copy of the outgoing e-mail containing an attachment to confirm this mailing.

### 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 Dispute Resolution Proceeding – Direct Request and all documents in support of the application in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*.

The Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding indicates that the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding – Direct Request was served on September 2, 2021. However, I find the landlord did not submit their Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request until September 20, 2021. I also find that the Notice of Dispute

Resolution Proceeding – Direct Request was not made available for service until September 28, 2021.

I also note that section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation* provides 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.*”

Policy Guideline #12 on Service Provisions provides that “*if there has been a history of communication between parties by email, but a party has not specifically provided an email address for service purposes, it is not advisable to use email as a service method.*”

The landlord has indicated they sent the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the tenant by e-mail. However, I find there is no evidence to demonstrate that the tenant specifically indicated documents could be served by e-mail.

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 Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request 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: October 29, 2021