



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 the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenants submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on May 4, 2020, the tenants sent the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by e-mail. The tenants provided a screenshot of a sent items folder showing six e-mails for dispute resolution, sent to the landlord on May 4, 2020.

The Residential Tenancy Branch's Director's Order on e-mail service dated March 30, 2020 provides that a document required to be sent in accordance with sections 88 and 89 of the *Act* may be sent by e-mail if the sender and recipient e-mail addresses have been routinely used for tenancy matters.

The tenants submitted fifty-six pages of text messages exchanged between the landlord and the tenants, referencing documents and payments sent using e-mail. I find the tenants have sufficiently demonstrated that e-mail was regularly used for tenancy issues.

Based on the written submissions of the tenants and in accordance with the Director's Order, I find that the landlord is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on May 7, 2020, the third day after their e-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*?

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 tenants submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and Tenant V.M. on January 1, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,950.00 and a security deposit of \$962.50, for a tenancy commencing on January 1, 2020;
- A copy of a letter from the tenants to the landlord dated April 4, 2019, providing the forwarding address and requesting the return of the deposit;
- 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 by e-mail and by text message on April 4, 2020;
- A copy of a text message sent to the landlord on April 5, 2020 containing the forwarding address letter and a copy of a reply text message from the landlord also dated April 5, 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 tenants, the partial reimbursement of \$336.75 made by the landlord, and stating that the tenancy ended on April 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).

Section 38(6) of the *Act* states that if the landlord does not return the deposit(s) or file a claim against them within the fifteen days, the landlord must pay the tenant double the amount of the deposit(s).

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the tenants paid a security deposit in the amount of \$962.50 as per the tenancy agreement.

I accept the tenants' statement on the Monetary Order Worksheet that the tenancy ended on April 1, 2020.

The tenants have indicated that their forwarding address was sent to the landlord by e-mail on April 4, 2020; however, I find the tenants have not submitted a copy of the outgoing e-mail containing the forwarding address to confirm this service.

The tenants have submitted a copy of a text message dated April 5, 2020 showing the forwarding address letter being sent to the landlord and a copy of a reply text message from the landlord also dated April 5, 2020.

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 tenants 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 tenants' forwarding address on the day the landlord replied to the tenants' text message.

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 April 5, 2020.

I accept the following declarations made by the tenant on the Monetary Order Worksheet:

- The tenants have not provided consent for the landlord to keep part of the deposit;
- There are no outstanding Monetary Orders against the tenants for this tenancy; and
- The tenants have not extinguished their right to the deposit in accordance with sections 24(1) and 36(1) of the *Act*.

I accept the evidence before me that the landlord has failed to return the full deposit to the tenants and has not filed an Application for Dispute Resolution requesting to retain a portion of the deposit by April 20, 2020, within the fifteen days granted under section 38(1) of the *Act*.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the landlord must pay the tenants double the balance of the security deposit in accordance sections 38(6) of the *Act*.

Therefore, I find that the tenants are entitled to a monetary award in the amount of \$1,251.50, double the amount claimed by the tenants for the balance of the security deposit, as of the date of this application, April 30, 2020.

As the tenants were successful in this application, I find that the tenants are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

Pursuant to sections 67 and 72 of the *Act*, I grant the tenants a Monetary Order in the amount of \$1,351.50 for the return of double the balance of the security deposit and for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The tenants are provided with this Order in the above terms and the landlord must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the landlord fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

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 08, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch