



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 two signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on February 27, 2021, the tenants sent each of the landlords the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The tenants provided a copy of a Canada Post receipt containing one tracking number to confirm this 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*?

Analysis

In this type of matter, the tenants must prove they served each of the landlords 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..."

The tenants have submitted a copy of two Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms; however, I find the tenants have only provided a copy of one Canada Post tracking number to confirm one package was sent on February 27, 2021.

Furthermore, I note that 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."

I find that the tracking number provided by the tenants is for a package sent by Canada Post's Regular Parcels mailing, which may or may not require a signature from the individual to confirm delivery to the person named as the respondent.

In this case, Canada Post's Online Tracking System shows that a signature was not required for the delivery of this mailing and, as such, it does not meet the definition of registered mail as defined under the *Act*.

Since I find that the tenants have not served each of the landlords with notice of this application in accordance with section 89 of the *Act*, I dismiss the tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit with leave to reapply.

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

The tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The tenants' application to recover the filing fee paid for this application is dismissed 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: March 15, 2021