



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      MNSDB-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 double the security deposit and the pet damage deposit (the deposits).

The tenant submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on September 16, 2020, the tenant sent the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The tenant provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the tenant and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord will be deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 21, 2020, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant entitled to monetary compensation for the return of a security deposit and a pet damage 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*?

### 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 tenant submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant on January 26, 2020, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,275.00, a security deposit of \$637.50, and a pet damage deposit of \$637.50, for a tenancy commencing on March 1, 2020;

- A copy of a Tenant's Notice of Forwarding Address for the Return of Security and/or Pet Damage Deposit (the forwarding address) dated August 19, 2020;
- 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 registered mail;
- A copy of a Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm the forwarding address was sent to the landlord on August 19, 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 deposits paid by the tenant and indicating the tenancy ended on July 15, 2020.

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and in accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord was deemed served with the forwarding address on August 24, 2020, five days after its registered mailing.

Section 38(1) of the *Act* states that within fifteen days of the tenancy ending and the landlord receiving the forwarding address, the landlord may either repay the deposits or make an application for dispute resolution claiming against the deposits.

I find that the fifteenth day for the landlord to have either returned the deposits or filed for dispute resolution was September 8, 2020.

However, section 90 of the *Act* states that a document sent by regular or registered mail is deemed received on the fifth day after it was sent. If the landlord sent the deposits by mail on their last day, the tenant may not have received the deposits until September 13, 2020.

I find that the tenant applied for dispute resolution on September 9, 2020, before they could have known whether the landlord complied with the provisions of section 38(1) of the *Act*, and that the earliest date the tenant could have applied for dispute resolution was September 14, 2020.

I find that the tenant made their application for dispute resolution too early.

Therefore, the tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of double the security deposit and the pet damage 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 double the security deposit and pet damage 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: September 18, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch