



# Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      MNSD, FFT

### Introduction

On May 16, 2018, the Tenant applied for a dispute resolution proceeding seeking double the amount of the security deposit pursuant to section 38 of the Act and seeking recovery of the filing fee pursuant to section 72 of the Act.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

- Is the Tenant entitled to double the security deposit?
- Is the Tenant entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the Landlord?

### Background and Evidence

This hearing was scheduled to commence via teleconference at 9:30 AM on June 29, 2018.

Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that the hearing must commence at the scheduled time unless otherwise decided by the Arbitrator. The Arbitrator may conduct the hearing in the absence of a party and may make a decision or dismiss the application, with or without leave to re-apply.

I dialed into the teleconference at 9:30 AM and monitored the teleconference until 9:44 AM. Neither the Applicant nor the Respondent dialed into the teleconference during this time. I confirmed that the correct call-in numbers and participant codes had been provided in the Notice of Hearing. I also confirmed from the teleconference system that I was the only person who had called into this teleconference.

### Analysis

As the Applicant did not attend the hearing by 9:44 AM, I find that the Application for Dispute Resolution has been abandoned.

### Conclusion

I dismiss the Application for Dispute Resolution with leave to reapply; however, this does not extend any applicable time limits under the legislation. I have not made any findings of fact or law with respect to the Application.

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: July 3, 2018

---

Residential Tenancy Branch