



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 April 22, 2021, the tenants sent the landlord the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by e-mail.

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*?

Analysis

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*.

Section 89 of the *Act* provides that a Notice of Direct Request Proceeding may be served "*by any other means of service provided for in the regulations.*"

Section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation* provides that documents "*may be given to a person by emailing a copy to an email address **provided as an address for service by the person.***"

The tenants have indicated they served the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the landlord by e-mail. However, I find there is no evidence to demonstrate that the landlord indicated documents could be served by e-mail.

I find the tenants have not demonstrated that the landlord's e-mail address was provided for service of documents, as required by section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding to the landlord and 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 the tenants are not entitled to recover the 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: May 07, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch