

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 (\$1,112.44)
- 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) in accordance with section 89 of the Act. The applicant provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the tracking number to confirm this service.

Based on the written submissions of the applicant and in accordance with section 90 of the Act, I find that Tenant B.M.D. was served on November 2, 2022, by registered mail, and is deemed to have received the Proceeding Package on November 7, 2022, the fifth day after the registered mailing.

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? (\$1,112.44)

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 June 21, 2021, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,096.45, due on the first day of the month for a tenancy commencing on June 20, 1986;
- A copy of a Notice of Rent Increase forms showing the rent being increased from \$1,096.45 to the monthly rent amount of \$1,112.44;
- A copy of a Real Estate Purchase and Sale Agreement showing the transfer of ownership from the landlord named in the tenancy agreement to a landlord who is not the applicant;
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated October 4, 2022, for \$1,112.44 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 October 17, 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 11:31 am on October 4, 2022;
- A Direct Request Worksheet showing 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 (Person P.J.B.) does not match the landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution (Business 1.P.L.P.).

The applicant submitted a copy of a purchase and sale agreement showing the rental property was sold. However, I find that the buyer listed in the document (Business C.P.L.) does not match the landlord's name on the Application.

On the Application for Dispute Resolution, the applicant has indicated that the purchaser and the applicant are united; however, the applicant has not submitted a copy of any documentation to confirm this fact.

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 and I have to ensure the applicant is entitled to have orders issued in their name.

I find 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: December 6, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch