



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 the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenant submitted a copy of a screenshot showing a Notice of Direct Request Proceeding was sent by text message.

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 tenants must prove they served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding. 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 find that 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.

The tenant must also prove they served the landlord the Notice of Direct Request proceeding with all the required inclusions as per section 89(1) of the *Act* which permits service by either leaving a copy with the person or their agent or sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the person resides or carries on business as a landlord.

The Residential Tenancy Branch's Director's Order on e-mail service dated March 30, 2020 provides that a document may also be sent by e-mail if the sender and recipient e-mail addresses have been routinely used for tenancy matters.

I find that the tenant sent the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by text message, which is not a method of service that is in accordance with section 89 of the *Act* or the Director's Order.

For these reasons, 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 12, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch