



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes OPR-DR, MNR-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 to obtain an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent, to obtain monetary compensation for unpaid rent, and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

This decision is written based on the Application for Dispute Resolution, evidence, and submissions provided by the landlord on August 19, 2022.

The landlord submitted two signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on August 20, 2022, the landlord served each tenant the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by handing both sets of documents to Tenant J.M. The landlord had a witness sign the Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms to confirm this service.

Based on the written submissions of the landlord and in accordance with section 89(1) of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were duly served to Tenant J.M. on August 20, 2022. In accordance with section 89(2) of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were duly served to Tenant M.M. on August 20, 2022.

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*?

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 landlord submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on November 8, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,600.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on November 15, 2020
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated July 26, 2022, for \$4,282.00 in unpaid rent and \$105.00 in unpaid utilities. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenants 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 August 4, 2022
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was served to the tenants in person at 6:08 pm on July 26, 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 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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that first page of the tenancy agreement submitted by the landlord is cut off and that the complete rental address is not visible.

I find that I am not able to confirm the address of the rental unit established in the tenancy agreement, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process.

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 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: September 15, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch