



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 the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenants submitted a copy of two envelopes showing that packages were mailed to the landlord.

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*?

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.

In this type of matter, the tenants 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*. Policy Guideline #49 on Tenant's Direct Request provides the following requirements:

"Once the package is served, the tenant must complete and submit a Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding (Form RTB-50) which is provided by the Branch with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding"

I note that the tenants submitted a copy of two envelopes to confirm packages were mailed to the landlord. However, the tenants have not provided a copy of the Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which are a requirement of the Direct Request process as detailed in Policy Guideline #49.

Furthermore, I note that the tenants must prove they served the landlord as per section 89 of the *Act* which permits service "by sending a copy by registered mail..."

The definition of registered mail is set out in section 1 of the *Act* as "any method of mail delivery provided by Canada Post for which confirmation of delivery to a named person is available."

The tenants have submitted documents showing that packages were sent using a Pitney Bowes machine, which is not a method of service offered through Canada Post. I also find that the envelopes do not contain tracking numbers or other evidence that signatures were required to confirm delivery to the persons named as the respondents.

As such, I find the tenants' mailings do not meet the definition of registered mail as defined under the *Act*.

For the reasons listed above, the tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit is dismissed with leave to reapply.

Conclusion

I dismiss the tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit 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: March 15, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch