



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **INTERIM 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 two signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on March 14, 2021, the tenants sent each of the landlords the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The tenants provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings.

### 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 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 to the address at which the landlord resides or carries on business as a landlord.

I find that the tenancy agreement submitted by the tenants does not provide an address for service for the landlords. There is also no indication as to whether the landlords reside or carry on business as landlords at the address where the Direct Request documents were sent.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notices of Direct Request Proceeding to the landlords, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process. For this reason, the

tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit is dismissed 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

I dismiss the tenants' application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit with leave to reapply.

I dismiss the tenants' 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: March 29, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch