



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, MNR-DR, FFL

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 filed by the applicant for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent and to recover the filing fee.

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.

Policy Guideline #39 provides direction to landlords making an application for dispute resolution through the Direct Request process. It confirms that a landlord must provide copies of certain documents, including those showing changes to the tenancy agreement or tenancy, such as rent increases, or changes to parties or their agents.

I have reviewed the documentary evidence and I find that the landlord’s name on the tenancy agreement (an individual person, J.B.) does not match the name provided on the application (a numbered company). The agent named in the application appears to be an agent of the numbered company. There is also no evidence or documentation showing that the numbered company is the owner of the rental property or is otherwise entitled to any orders that may result from this application.

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 applicant's requests for an order of possession and a monetary order for unpaid rent are dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the applicant was not successful, I find that the applicant's request to recover the \$100.00 filing fee 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 15, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch