



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

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 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.

This decision is written based on the Application for Dispute Resolution, evidence, and submissions provided by the applicant on September 14, 2022.

The applicant submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 27, 2022, the applicant served the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request in person. The applicant had a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form to confirm personal service.

Based on the written submissions of the applicant 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 27, 2022.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the applicant entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the applicant entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Is the applicant entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

I have reviewed all written submissions and evidence before me; however, only the evidence and submissions relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

The applicant submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which names a landlord who is not the applicant and was signed by the tenant on January 27, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,038.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on February 1, 2020
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form which was not signed or dated by the landlord, showing the rent being increased from \$1,038.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,053.00
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated September 2, 2022, for \$9,183.00 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenant 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 September 13, 2022
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was served to the tenant in person at 10:00 am on September 2, 2022
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing and ledger the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy

Analysis

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the applicant 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 applicant 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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the landlord's name on the tenancy agreement (F.S.R.B.L.) and the building name on the agreement (F.H.V.) do not match the landlord's name on tenancy addendum (F.H.H.S.A.) or the landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution (F.H.H.V.A.S.). There is also no

documentation showing that name of the applicant is the correct legal name of the owner or landlord of the rental property.

As this is an *ex parte* proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, I have to be satisfied with the documentation presented. The discrepancy in the landlord's name raises a question that cannot be addressed in a Direct Request Proceeding.

For this reason, the applicant's request for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the applicant was not successful in this application, I find that the applicant is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the applicant's request for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the applicant's request 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 27, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch