

DECISION

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 the landlord's Application for Dispute Resolution (Application) for:

- an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the Act
- a Monetary Order for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the Act (\$1,014.00)
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant pursuant to section 72 of the Act (\$100.00)

Service of Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Landlord's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that the tenant was served with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail.

Issue(s) to be decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent?

Is the landlord entitled to a Monetary Order for unpaid rent? (\$1,014.00)

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant? (\$100.00)

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 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 Landlord's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding instructs the landlord to attach a completed Canada Post Registered Mail Receipt to confirm service.

I note that the landlord hand-wrote a tracking number on the Proof of Service form; however, I find the landlord has not submitted a copy of the Canada Post Registered Mail Receipt itself.

Furthermore, section 89 of the Act permits service by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides or, by sending a copy by registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant.

I find that the Proof of Service Landlord's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding states the Direct Request documents were sent to a city that does not match the rental address on the Application for Dispute Resolution and the tenancy agreement.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the tenant.

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

The landlord's application for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the Act is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

The landlord's application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent, pursuant to section 67 of the Act, is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The landlord's application for authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the tenant, pursuant to section 72 of the Act, 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: November 10, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch