



# 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 a copy of a Canada Post Customer Receipt containing a tracking number to confirm a package was sent to the landlord by registered mail on May 21, 2021.

### 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*?

### Background and Evidence

The tenants submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and two of the tenants on May 14, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,500.00 and a security deposit of \$750.00, for a tenancy commencing on June 10, 2019
- A copy of an e-mail from the tenants to the landlord dated April 13, 2021 providing the forwarding address
- A copy of a reply e-mail from the landlord also dated April 13, 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.

In this type of matter, the tenants must prove they served the landlord with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request and all documents in support of the application as indicated on the Notice as per section 89 of the *Act*. Policy Guideline #49 on Tenant's Direct Request provides the following requirements:

*"Once the package is served, the tenant must complete and submit a Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding (Form RTB-50) which is provided by the Branch with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding"*

I note that the tenants submitted a copy of a Canada Post receipt containing a tracking number to confirm a package was sent to the landlord on May 21, 2021. However, the tenants have not provided a copy of the Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form which is a requirement of the Direct Request process as detailed in Policy Guideline #49.

Policy Guideline #49 also requires an applicant to 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 tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution without these documents which form a part of the Application.

I find the tenants have not provided the documents required for the Direct Request process and 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: May 31, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch