



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, MNR-DR, FFL

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 filed by the Landlord for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent and to recover the filing fee.

The Landlord submitted signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents which declare that the Landlord served each Tenant with a Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding and supporting evidence by registered mail on February 7, 2022. Service in this manner was supported by Canada Post registered mail receipts which confirmed the date and time of purchase and included the tracking number. Pursuant to sections 89 and 90 of the Act, I find these documents are deemed to have been received by the Tenants on February 12, 2022, five days after they were mailed.

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 confirms that a landlord making an application for dispute resolution by Direct Request must provide certain documentation including documents showing changes to the tenancy agreement or tenancy, such as rent increases, or changes to parties or their agents.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the corporate Landlord named in the application does not match the name of the individual landlord named in the tenancy agreement. However, the Landlord did not submit documentation showing changes to parties or their agents. As a result, I find there is insufficient evidence before me to confirm the Landlord is authorized to have orders issued in their name.

Considering the above, I order that the Landlord's requests for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent are dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the Landlord has not been successful, I order that the Landlord's request to recover the filing fee is dismissed 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: February 23, 2022

---

Residential Tenancy Branch