Dispute Resolution Services

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 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 24, 2020, the tenant personally served the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding.

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*?

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 that they served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding.

On the Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms there is no signature of a witness, or a signature of the person who received the documents, to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the landlord.

Furthermore, I note that section 9 of the *Ministerial Order M089* issued March 30, 2020, pursuant to the State of Emergency declared on March 18, 2020 states that a person must not give or serve any document by leaving a copy of the document with a person.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the landlord, which is a requirement of the Direct Request Proceeding. For this reason, the tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of 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 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: May 07, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch