



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 tenants for a Monetary Order seeking the return of their security deposit.

The tenants submitted a signed “Proof of Service of the Tenant’s Notice of Direct Request Proceeding” form which declares that on September 17, 2020 the tenants served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, along with copies of supporting documents, via registered mail. The tenants provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. Section 90 of the *Act* determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been received five days after service.

Based on the written submissions of the tenants, and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the landlord is deemed to have received the Direct Request Proceeding documents on September 22, 2020, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the tenants entitled to a monetary award for the return of all or a portion of their security deposit pursuant to section 38 of the *Act*?

Are the tenants entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the landlord 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.

On the tenants' Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request (the "application"), the tenants have requested a Monetary Order seeking the return of their security deposit in the amount of \$454.30.

As part of their evidentiary material package, the tenants provided, in part, a copy of a "Proof of Service Tenant Forwarding Address for the Return of Security and/or Pet Damage Deposit" form, on which the tenants asserted that they provided their forwarding address to the landlord by way of providing the forwarding address on the move-out condition inspection report. The tenants did not provide a copy of the move-out condition inspection report as evidence.

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.

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.*

The tenants asserted that they served their forwarding address to the landlord by way of providing the forwarding address to the landlord on the move-out condition inspection report. Policy Guideline # 49 provides, in part, the following:

The forwarding address can be given in the form of a letter or on the condition inspection report and an applicant must be able to prove they served the landlord with the forwarding address. If the tenant provided their forwarding address on the move-out condition inspection report, the director may accept the landlord's signature on the condition inspection report as confirmation of service.

Policy Guideline # 49 also provides, as noted above, that the tenant must provide a copy of the condition inspection report containing the forwarding address if the tenants provided their forwarding address to the landlord on the move-out condition inspection report.

I find that the tenants did not provide a copy of the move-out condition inspection report as required in accordance with Policy Guideline # 49. Therefore, I find that the tenants' application does not contain all of the required documents cited above and is therefore incomplete.

I find that there is no evidentiary material before me to prove that the tenants served their forwarding address by way of providing the forwarding address to the landlord on the move-out condition inspection report. Therefore, I find that I cannot confirm that the landlord has been served with the tenants' forwarding address in accordance with the *Act*, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process as outlined in Policy Guideline #49.

As I am not able to confirm service of the Forwarding Address to the landlord, which is a requirement of the Direct Request Proceeding, I find that a hearing is necessary to address this issue. I find that a participatory hearing will provide the proper venue to make a determination on the issues identified above and to hear the tenants' request seeking the return of their 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 tenants' application.

Notices of Reconvened Hearing are enclosed with this interim decision. The applicants 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: October 05, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch