



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Ministry of Housing

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNRL, FFL

Introduction

Pursuant to section 58 of the Residential Tenancy Act (the Act), I was designated to hear an application regarding the above-noted tenancy. The landlords applied for:

- a monetary order for unpaid rent, pursuant to section 26; and
- an authorization to recover the filing fee for this application, under section 72.

Landlord VC (the landlord) and tenants AZ, CM and MM attended the hearing. Tenant AZ represented tenant CG. All were given a full opportunity to be heard, to present affirmed testimony, to make submissions, and to call witnesses.

At the outset of the hearing all the parties were clearly informed of the Rules of Procedure, including Rule 6.10 about interruptions and inappropriate behaviour, and Rule 6.11, which prohibits the recording of a dispute resolution hearing. All the parties confirmed they understood the Rules of Procedure.

Per section 95(3) of the Act, the parties may be fined up to \$5,000.00 if they record this hearing: "A person who contravenes or fails to comply with a decision or an order made by the director commits an offence and is liable on conviction to a fine of not more than \$5,000.00."

The notice of hearing is dated June 20, 2022.

The landlord affirmed he served the notice of hearing and the evidence (the materials) to the tenants on May 05, 2022 and another date. The landlord does not know when he served the materials and is not aware of the tracking numbers.

Tenant AZ confirmed receipt of the notice of hearing and stated that tenant CG is not aware of this application. Tenants CM and MC testified they did not receive the notice of hearing and learned of this application because they received an email from the Residential Tenancy Branch.

Section 89 of the Act states:

(1)An application for dispute resolution or a decision of the director to proceed with a review under Division 2 of Part 5, when required to be given to one party by another, must be given in one of the following ways:

- (a)by leaving a copy with the person;
- (b)if the person is a landlord, by leaving a copy with an agent of the landlord;
- (c)by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides or, if the person is a landlord, to the address at which the person carries on business as a landlord;
- (d)if the person is a tenant, by sending a copy by registered mail to a forwarding address provided by the tenant;
- (e)as ordered by the director under section 71 (1) [director's orders: delivery and service of documents].

(2)An application by a landlord under section 55 [order of possession for the landlord], 56 [application for order ending tenancy early] or 56.1 [order of possession: tenancy frustrated] must be given to the tenant in one of the following ways:

- (a)by leaving a copy with the tenant;
- (b)by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the tenant resides;
- (c)by leaving a copy at the tenant's residence with an adult who apparently resides with the tenant;
- (d)by attaching a copy to a door or other conspicuous place at the address at which the tenant resides;
- (e)as ordered by the director under section 71 (1) [director's orders: delivery and service of documents].

Residential Tenancy Branch Policy Guideline 12 states:

All parties named on an application for dispute resolution must be served notice of proceedings, including any supporting documents submitted with the application. **Where more than one party is named on an application for dispute resolution, each party must be served separately. Failure to serve documents in a way recognized by the Legislation may result in the application being adjourned, dismissed with leave to reapply, or dismissed without leave to reapply.**

(emphasis added)

Based on the landlord's vague testimony, I find the tenants were not served in accordance with the Act, as the landlord could not inform the dates he served the materials to all the tenants and the registered mail tracking numbers.

As such, I dismiss the landlords' application for a monetary order with leave to reapply. Leave to reapply is not an extension of timeline to apply.

As the landlords were not successful in this application, I find that the landlords are not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the landlords' application with 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: February 21, 2023

Residential Tenancy Branch