



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding BROWN BROS AGENCY and
[tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes 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, a monetary order, and recovery of the filing fee.

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the landlord to ensure that all evidentiary material submitted 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.

Policy Guideline #39 on Direct Requests provides the following information:

When making an application for dispute resolution through the direct request process, the landlord must provide copies of:

- The written tenancy agreement;
- Documents showing changes to the tenancy agreement or tenancy, such as rent increases, or **changes to parties or their agents**;
- The Direct Request Worksheet (form RTB-46) setting out the amount of rent or utilities owing which may be accompanied by supporting documents such as a rent ledger or receipt book;
- The 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities (this is often considered proof that the tenant did not pay rent); and,

- Proof that the landlord served the tenant with the 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent or Utilities and, if applicable, the Written Demand to Pay Utilities.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the Landlord's name on the tenancy agreement does not match the Landlord's name on the Application for Dispute Resolution. As this is an *ex parte* proceeding that does not allow for any clarification of the facts, I must 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 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.

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 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 21, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch