



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Cascadia apartment rentals 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 one signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on February 10, 2022, the landlord sent the tenants the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord provided a copy of one Canada Post Customer Receipt containing one tracking number 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 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.

In this type of matter, the landlord must prove they served the tenants 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* and in a manner that is considered necessary as per section 71(2) (a) of the *Act*.

Policy Guideline #12 on Service Provisions provides the following requirement:

“Important: all parties named on an application for dispute resolution must receive notice of the proceedings. Where more than one party is named on an application, each party must be served separately.”

I find that the registered mail receipt submitted by the landlord shows that the landlord has placed all three Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request in the same envelope with multiple persons named. In an ex parte hearing, I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to each of the parties individually as required by sections 71 and 89 of the *Act*.

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 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 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: March 02, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch