



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

INTERIM 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 seeking the return of her security deposit.

The tenant submitted a signed “Proof of Service of the Tenant’s Notice of Direct Request Proceeding” form which declares that on May 08, 2020, the tenant served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, along with copies of supporting documents, via email.

On March 30, 2020, the Executive Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch (“RTB”) authorized a *Director’s Order* which, pursuant to sections 71(2)(b) and (c) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*, orders that until the declaration of the state of emergency made under the *Emergency Program Act* on March 18, 2020 is cancelled or expires without being extended:

a document of the type described in section 88 or 89 of the Residential Tenancy Act has been sufficiently given or served for the purposes of the Act if the document is given or served on the person in one of the following ways:

- *the document is emailed to the email address of the person to whom the document is to be given or served, and that person confirms receipt of the document by way of return email in which case the document is deemed to have been received on the date the person confirms receipt;*
- *the document is emailed to the email address of the person to whom the document is to be given or served, and that person responds to the email without identifying an issue with the transmission or viewing of the document,*

or with their understanding of the document, in which case the document is deemed to have been received on the date the person responds; or

- the document is emailed to the email address that the person to whom the document is to be given or served has routinely used to correspond about tenancy matters from an email address that the person giving or serving the document has routinely used for such correspondence, in which case the document is deemed to have been received three days after it was emailed*

Based on the written submissions of the tenant, and pursuant to the above-noted *Director's Order*, and pursuant to sections 71(2)(b) and (c) of the Act, I find that the landlord is deemed to have received the the Direct Request Proceeding documents on May 11, 2020, three days after they were sent to the landlord by the tenant by way of email.

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.

On the tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request (the "application"), the tenant has requested a Monetary Order seeking a return of her security deposit in the amount of \$825.00.

Analysis

Direct Request proceedings are *ex parte* proceedings. In an *ex parte* proceeding, the opposing party is not invited to participate in the hearing or make any submissions. As there is no ability for the landlord to participate, there is a much higher burden placed on tenant in these types of proceedings than in a participatory hearing. This higher burden protects the procedural rights of the excluded party and ensures that the natural justice requirements of the Residential Tenancy Branch are satisfied.

In this type of matter, the tenant must prove they served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the forwarding address, and all related documents with respect to the Direct Request process, in accordance with the *Act* and Policy Guidelines. 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 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.

The Direct Request process is a mechanism that allows a tenant to apply for an expedited decision, and as such, the tenant must follow and submit documentation exactly as prescribed by the Act and Policy Guideline #49 – Tenant's Direct Request. There can be no omissions or deficiencies with items being left open to interpretation or inference.

Section 59 of the *Act* establishes that an Application for Dispute Resolution must "include the full particulars of the dispute that is to be the subject of the dispute resolution proceedings."

Residential Tenancy Policy Guideline # 49 contains the details about the key elements that need to be considered when making an application for Direct Request. Policy Guideline # 49 states that when making an Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request to seek return of a security deposit, the tenant must provide the following documents:

- *A copy of the signed tenancy agreement showing the initial amount of rent, the amount of security deposit required, and if applicable, the amount of pet damage deposit required;*
- *If a pet damage deposit was accepted after the tenancy began, a receipt for the deposit;*
- *A copy of the forwarding address given to the landlord (Form RTB-47 is recommended, but not required) or a copy of the condition inspection report with the forwarding address provided;*
- *A completed Proof of Service of Forwarding Address (Form RTB-41);*
- *A Tenant's Direct Request Worksheet (Form RTB-40); and*
- *The date the tenancy ended.*

I find that the tenant's application does not contain all of the required documents cited above and is therefore incomplete. The tenant has not provided a copy a completed Proof of Service of Forwarding Address form (Form RTB-41), or a complete Tenant's Direct Request Worksheet (Form RTB-40), as the Direct Request Worksheet provided by the tenant is incomplete and is missing the last page.

I further find that I am not able to consider the tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution by way of the Direct Request process without the documents cited above, which form a part of the Application, and that a participatory hearing is necessary. I find that a participatory hearing will provide the proper venue to hear the tenant's application for a monetary order seeking the return of her security deposit.

Conclusion

I order that the direct request proceeding be reconvened in accordance with section 74 of the *Act*. I find that a participatory hearing to be conducted by an Arbitrator appointed under the *Act* is required in order to determine the details of the tenant's application.

Notices of Reconvened Hearing are enclosed with this interim decision. The applicant must serve the Notice of Reconvened Hearing, the interim decision, and all other required documents, upon the landlord within three (3) days of receiving this decision in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*.

Each party must serve the other and the Residential Tenancy Branch with any evidence that they intend to reply upon at the new hearing. For more information see our website at: gov.bc.ca/landlordtenant.

If either party has any questions they may contact an Information Officer with the Residential Tenancy Branch at:

Lower Mainland: 604-660-1020
Elsewhere in BC: 1-800-665-8779

This interim 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 29, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch