



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 for the return of double the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenants submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on November 8, 2020, the tenants sent the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The tenants provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the Tracking Number to confirm this mailing. 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 been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on November 13, 2020, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the tenants entitled to monetary compensation for the return of a security deposit pursuant to sections 38 and 67 of the *Act*?

Are the tenants 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 tenants submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on August 3, 2017, indicating a monthly rent of \$4,995.00 and a security deposit of \$2,497.50, for a tenancy commencing on August 15, 2017;

- A copy of a note indicating that a forwarding address was provided to the landlord during the move-out inspection on September 30, 2020;
- A blank 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); and
- A blank copy of a Tenant's Monetary Order Worksheet for an Expedited Return of Security Deposit and/or Pet Damage Deposit (the Tenant's Direct Request Worksheet).

Analysis

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 that such evidentiary material 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.

Section 59 of the *Act* establishes that an Application for Dispute Resolution must "include the full particulars of the dispute that is to be the subject of the dispute resolution proceedings."

Policy Guideline #49 on Tenant's Direct Request provides the following requirements:

When making a request, an applicant must provide:

- A copy of the signed tenancy agreement showing the initial amount of rent and the amount of security deposit and/or pet damage deposit required;
- If a pet damage deposit was accepted after the tenancy began, a receipt for the pet damage deposit;
- A copy of the forwarding address given to the landlord;
- A completed Proof of Service of Forwarding Address;
- A Tenant's Direct Request Worksheet; and
- The date the tenancy ended.

I find that the tenants have not submitted a copy of the forwarding address, a completed Proof of Service of Forwarding Address form, or a completed Tenant's Direct Request Worksheet. I further find that I am not able to consider the tenants' Application for Dispute Resolution without these documents which form a part of the Application, and that a participatory hearing is necessary.

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. Fact sheets are available at <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/residential-tenancies/information-sheets/rtb114.pdf> that explain evidence and service requirements.

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

Victoria: 250-387-1602

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: November 27, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch