

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 an 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 (\$1,635.72)
- 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 applicant 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 (Proceeding Package) by posting to the door of the rental unit. The applicant had a witness sign the Proof of Service Landlord's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form to confirm this service. Based on the written submissions of the applicant and in accordance with sections 89(2) and 90 of the Act:

- I find that Tenant D.A.W.R. was served on October 12, 2022, by posting to the door, and is deemed to have received the Proceeding Package on October 15, 2022, the third day after its posting.

Issue(s) to be decided

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

Is the applicant entitled to a Monetary Order for unpaid rent? (\$1,635.72)

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

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 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 September 1, 2021, indicating a monthly rent of \$900.00, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on August 29, 2021;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase form showing the rent being increased from \$900.00 to the monthly rent amount of \$913.50
- A copy of a notice to all tenants indicating a new owner of the rental property who is not the applicant
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated September 3, 2022, for \$1,635.72 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 posted to the tenant's door at 5:43 pm on September 3, 2022;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the landlord's name on the ownership change notice (Business 1.B.L.) does not match the landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution (Person K.P.). There is also no evidence or documentation showing that the applicant is the owner of the business landlord or is otherwise entitled to have orders issued in their name.

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

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

The applicant's request 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 16, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch