



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSD, FFT

Introduction

This hearing dealt with the tenant's application pursuant to the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the *Act*) for:

- a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit, pursuant to sections 38 and 67; and
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the landlord, pursuant to section 72.

The landlord did not attend this hearing, although I left the teleconference hearing connection open until 1:40 p.m. in order to enable the landlord to call into this teleconference hearing scheduled for 1:30 p.m. The tenant attended the hearing and was given a full opportunity to be heard, to present affirmed testimony, to make submissions and to call witnesses. I confirmed that the correct call-in numbers and participant codes had been provided in the Notice of Hearing. I also confirmed from the teleconference system that the tenant and I were the only ones who had called into this teleconference.

Preliminary Issue- Service

The tenant testified that he served the landlord with his application for dispute resolution via e-mail sometime in June 2020. The tenant did not enter the above e-mail into evidence. The tenant testified that the landlord did not respond to his email serving the landlord with his application for dispute resolution and that he could not prove that he and the landlord regularly used the service email to communicate about tenancy related matters.

Service of the tenant's application for dispute resolution was permitted from March 30, 2020 to June 23, 2020, pursuant to the March 30, 2020 Director's Order. The Director's Order stated:

a document of the type described in section 88 or 89 of the Residential Tenancy Act or section 81 or 82 of the Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act has been sufficiently given or served for the purposes of the applicable 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

I find that the tenant has not proved that the landlord was served with his application for dispute resolution. I therefore dismiss the tenant's application with leave to reapply. At the hearing, I advised the tenant that I was dismissing his application with leave to reapply.

I notified the tenant that if he wished to pursue this matter further, he would have to file a new application. I cautioned him to be prepared to prove service at the next hearing, as per section 89 of the *Act*.

Conclusion

I dismiss the tenant's application to recover the \$100.00 filing fee without leave to reapply.

The remainder of the tenant's application is dismissed with 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: October 05, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch