



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSDB-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 and the pet damage deposit (the deposits).

The tenants submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on February 3, 2021, 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 in fact took place on January 27, 2021. 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 February 1, 2021, 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 and a pet damage 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

The tenant submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenants on April 6, 2015, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,500.00, a security deposit of \$750.00, and a pet damage deposit of \$250.00, for a tenancy commencing on April 6, 2015
- A copy of a letter from the tenants to the landlord dated January 4, 2021, providing the forwarding address and requesting the return of the deposits

- A copy of a Canada Post receipt containing a Tracking Number to confirm a package was sent by registered mail on January 4, 2021

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.**
- The date the tenancy ended.

I find that the tenants have not submitted a copy of a Proof of Service of Forwarding Address form or a 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.

For this reason, the tenants’ application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit and the pet damage 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 and the pet damage 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 01, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch

DECISION/ORDER AMENDED PURSUANT TO SECTION 78(1)(A)
OF THE RESIDENTIAL TENANCY ACT ON **MARCH 3, 2021**
AT THE PLACES INDICATED IN **BOLD OR USING STRIKETHROUGH.**

Residential Tenancy Branch