



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## DECISION

Dispute Codes      MNSDS-DR, FFT

### Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 38.1 of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the *Act*), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the tenant for a Monetary Order for the return of double the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenant submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 1, 2020, the tenant sent the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The tenant provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the tenant and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on April 6, 2020, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant entitled to monetary compensation for the return of a security deposit pursuant to sections 38 and 67 of the *Act*?

Is the tenant 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 tenant submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord on May 6, 2018 and the tenant on May 7, 2018, indicating a monthly rent of \$2,000.00 and a security deposit of \$1,000.00, for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2018;

- A copy of a text message from the tenant to the landlord dated March 9, 2020, providing the tenant's forwarding address;
- A copy of a Proof of Service Tenant Forwarding Address for the Return of Security and/or Pet Damage Deposit form (Proof of Service of the Forwarding Address) which indicates that the forwarding address was sent to the landlord electronically on March 9, 2020; and
- A copy of a Tenant's Monetary Order Worksheet for an Expedited Return of Security Deposit and/or Pet Damage Deposit (the Monetary Order Worksheet) showing the amount of deposit paid by the tenant, the partial amount reimbursed by the landlord, and stating that the tenancy ended on February 1, 2020.

### Analysis

Section 38(1) of the *Act* states that the landlord has fifteen days from the end of tenancy and the date they received the forwarding address to either return the deposit(s) in full or make an application for dispute resolution claiming against the deposit(s).

I accept that the tenancy ended on February 1, 2020, the date indicated on the Monetary Order Worksheet.

Section 71(2)(c) of the *Act* enables me to make an order that a document not served in accordance with section 88 or 89 is sufficiently given or served for purposes of this *Act*.

I find that the tenant sent their forwarding address to the landlord by text message, which is not a method of service permitted under section 88 of the *Act*. However, I am satisfied that the landlord received the tenant's forwarding address as the landlord sent a reply text the same day.

For this reason, and in accordance with section 71(2)(c) of the *Act*, I find that the landlord has been served with the forwarding address on March 9, 2020.

I find that the fifteenth day for the landlord to have either returned the deposits or filed for dispute resolution was March 24, 2020.

I find that the tenant applied for dispute resolution on March 21, 2020, before the landlord's last day to repay the deposit or file for dispute resolution, and that the earliest date the tenant could have applied for dispute resolution was March 25, 2020.

I find that the tenant made their application for dispute resolution too early.

Therefore, the tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of double the security deposit is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the tenant was not successful in this application, I find that the tenant is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of double the security deposit with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the tenant'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: April 08, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch