



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 signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 24, 2021, the tenants sent the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail to Tenant B.W. The tenants provided a copy of the Canada Post receipt containing the tracking number to confirm this mailing.

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 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* 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 Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding indicates that the tenants sent the Direct Request documents to Tenant B.W and not to the landlord. I also find that the address indicated on the Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form is not the landlord's address for service as established in the tenancy agreement.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the landlord, 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: June 28, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch