



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 tenants for a Monetary Order for the return of double the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenants submitted a Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 2, 2020, the tenants sent the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The tenants provided a copy of a UPS Parcel Shipping Order to confirm this mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

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

Are the tenants entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Analysis

In this type of matter, the tenants must prove they served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per subsections 89 (1) and (2) of the *Act* which permit service "by sending a copy by registered mail..."

The definition of registered mail is set out in section 1 of the *Act* as "any method of mail delivery provided by Canada Post for which confirmation of delivery to a named person is available."

I find that the tenants have sent the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by UPS parcel which is not a method of mail delivery offered by Canada Post and, as such, this mailing does not meet the definition of registered mail as defined under the *Act*.

Since I find that the tenants have not served the landlord with notice of this application in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I dismiss the tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit with leave to reapply.

As the tenants were not successful in this application, I find that the tenants are not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

The tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The tenants' application to recover the filing fee paid for this application 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: April 08, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch