

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 (\$2,769.00)
- 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 copy of a Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form for a different file number which declares that on December 7, 2021, they sent the tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request (Proceeding Package) by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlord submitted a copy of a Canada Post Customer Receipt with a different tracking number dated October 15, 2022 along with the Proof of Service form.

Issues 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? (\$2,769.00)

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*.

I find that the landlord has submitted a copy of a Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form for a different file number discussing service of a Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request on December 7, 2021. I further find that the Canada Post Customer Receipt submitted by the landlord to confirm service of the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request is dated October 15, 2022 with a different tracking number.

I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the tenant, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process, and 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 18, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch