

Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

<u>Dispute Codes</u> OPR-DR, MNR-DR, FFL

<u>Introduction</u>

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 22, 2021, the landlord personally served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding 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 tenant on September 22, 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*?

<u>Analysis</u>

Along with their Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the landlord submitted a copy of a Condition Inspection Report indicating the tenant moved out of the rental unit on September 18, 2021.

Page: 2

I find the tenant has vacated the rental property, and that an Order of Possession is not required. For this reason, the landlord's application for an Order of Possession for unpaid rent based on the 10 Day Notice dated September 2, 2021, is dismissed without leave to reapply.

I also note that, in a Direct Request Proceeding, a Monetary Order is only available if the landlord is successful in obtaining an Order of Possession. I also note that the purpose of a Direct Request is not to obtain a faster resolution of a financial claim.

The landlord was not successful in obtaining an Order of Possession and for this reason, the landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the landlord was not successful in this application, I find that 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 for unpaid rent based on the 10 Day Notice dated September 2, 2021, without leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application for 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: November 05, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch