



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 tenant for a Monetary Order for the return of double the security deposit (the deposit).

The tenant submitted two signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on May 5, 2021, the tenant sent each of the landlords the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail. The tenant provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipts containing the Tracking Numbers to confirm these mailings. Based on the written submissions of the tenant and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the landlords are deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on May 10, 2021, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant entitled to monetary compensation for the return of a security deposit pursuant to sections 38 and 67 of the *Act*?

Is the tenant entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

Background and Evidence

I have reviewed all written submissions and evidence before me; however, only the evidence and submissions relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

The tenant submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlords on June 6, 2019 and the tenant on June 5, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,600.00 and a security deposit of \$800.00, for a tenancy commencing on June 15, 2019

- A copy of an e-mail confirmation from Canada Post that the tenant has engaged the mail forwarding service

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 tenant has not submitted a copy of a forwarding address that provided to the landlords. The tenant has indicated that they set up mail forwarding to their new address. However, I find this does not satisfy the requirement of section 38 of the *Act* for a written forwarding address.

I also find the tenant has 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 tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution without these documents which form a part of the Application.

For this reason, the tenant’s application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the tenant was not successful in this application, I find the tenant is not entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

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

I dismiss the tenant's 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 17, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch