



# 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 tenant for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenant submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on October 21, 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.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant entitled to monetary compensation for the return of a security 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*?

### Analysis

In this type of matter, the tenant must prove they served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding with all the required inclusions as indicated on the Notice as per section 89 of the *Act* which permits service by sending a copy by registered mail to the address at which the landlord resides or carries on business as a landlord.

I find that the Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form indicates that the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding documents were sent to an address where the street number that begins "34..."

However, the Canada Post Customer Receipt indicates that the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding was sent to street number "37..."

I find I am not able to confirm to which address the the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding was sent, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process.

For this reason, the tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security 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 the security 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: November 03, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch