



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 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 October 07, 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 October 12, 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 \$5,200.00.

The tenants provided an evidentiary material package which does not include a completed "Proof of Service of Forwarding Address" form (Form RTB-41).

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.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the tenant. 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.*

Policy Guideline # 49 additionally provides the following:

The tenant must prove they served their forwarding address to the landlord. An applicant is required to complete the Proof of Service of Forwarding Address (Form RTB-41) for this purpose.

I find that the tenants' application does not contain all of the required documents cited above and is therefore incomplete. The tenants have not provided a copy of a completed Proof of Service of Forwarding Address form (Form RTB-41).

Of particular relevance is that the tenants did not provide any evidence to demonstrate that they provided their forwarding address in writing to the landlord as required in accordance with section 38(1) of the Act. The tenants have not demonstrated via any documentary evidence that they provided their forwarding address in writing to the landlord in accordance with the Act, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process as outlined in Policy Guideline #49.

As it appears that the tenants may not have satisfied the requirement of providing their forwarding address to the landlord, it may not be open to the tenants to seek the return

of their security deposit pursuant to the other relevant subsections of section 38 of the Act.

As noted above, the tenants have submitted an incomplete application which does not include the required documents cited in Policy Guideline # 49. I find that I am not able to consider the tenants' Application for Dispute Resolution by way of the Direct Request process without the document cited above, which forms a part of a complete Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request. Additionally, the tenants have not proven that their forwarding address in writing was provided to the landlord, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process.

As previously indicated, 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.

I find that there are deficiencies with this application, as outlined above, which cannot be clarified within the narrow scope of the Direct Request process. These deficiencies cannot be remedied by inferences in the absence of more evidentiary material, or oral testimony, which may clarify the questions raised by these inconsistencies.

Based on the foregoing, I dismiss the tenants' application seeking the return of his security deposit, with leave to reapply.

It remains open to the tenants to review section 38 of the Act to determine whether they have adhered to the requirement of providing their forwarding address in writing to the landlord at the end of the tenancy if the return of his security deposit is sought. The tenants may wish to determine if they need to serve—or re-serve—their forwarding address in writing to the landlord using a method of service approved under section 88 of the Act.

As the tenants were not successful in this application, I find that the tenants are not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the tenants' application seeking the return of their security deposit, with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the tenants' request to recover the \$100.00 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: October 28, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch