



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## DECISION

Dispute Codes      MNSDS-DR

### 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 the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenant submitted a copy of an e-mail from the tenant to Person J.M. dated April 23, 2020, containing attachments of the supporting documents for this dispute.

### 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*?

### Analysis

In an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the tenant 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 tenant 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.

In this type of matter, the tenant must prove they served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice. Policy Guideline #49 on Tenant's Direct Request provides the following requirements:

*"Once the package is served, the tenant must complete and submit a Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding (Form RTB-50) which is provided by the Branch with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding"*

I note that the tenant submitted a copy of an e-mail sent to Person J.M. on April 23, 2020. However, the tenant has not provided a copy of the Proof of Service Tenant's

Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which is a requirement of the Direct Request process as detailed in Policy Guideline #49.

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

I also note that the tenant indicated on their Application for Dispute Resolution that their representative was not able to give the landlord the forwarding address at the move-out inspection.

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).

In order to be successful in the Direct Request process, the tenant must be able to demonstrate that a copy of the written forwarding address was served to the landlord.

### Conclusion

I dismiss the tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit with 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: May 05, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch