



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, OPRM-DR, FFL

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 by the landlord for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlord submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on November 20, 2020, the landlord sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by e-mail in accordance with a substituted service decision.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the landlord entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Is the landlord entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

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.

On the Proof of Service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the landlord has indicated they sent the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenant by e-mail as they were granted substituted service.

I note that the substituted service decision provides the landlord with the following instruction:

"I order the landlord to provide proof of service of the e-mail which may include a printout of the sent item, a confirmation of delivery receipt, or other documentation to confirm the landlord has served the tenant in accordance with this order. If possible, the landlord should provide a read receipt confirming the e-mail was opened and viewed by the tenant."

I find the landlord has not submitted a copy of the outgoing e-mail or any of the other supporting documentation to confirm they complied with the substituted service order.

As I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the tenant, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process, 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

I dismiss the landlord's application for an Order of Possession and a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the landlord's application to recover the filing fee paid for this application 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 04, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch