

# **Dispute Resolution Services**

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

<u>Dispute Codes</u> MNSDB-DR, FFT

#### <u>Introduction</u>

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 the security deposit and the pet damage deposit (the deposits).

The tenant submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 25, 2021, the tenant sent the landlord the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant 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*?

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

#### Analysis

Res judicata prevents a plaintiff from pursuing a claim that already has been decided and also prevents a defendant from raising any new defense to defeat the enforcement of an earlier judgment.

A previously decided issue is comparable to the criminal law concept of double jeopardy.

I find the landlord applied for Dispute Resolution on February 11, 2021 requesting to keep the security deposit and the pet damage deposit. On June 28, 2021, the Arbitrator rendered a decision allowing the landlord to keep the security deposit and the pet damage deposit towards amounts owed by the tenant.

I therefore find that this current application is *res judicata*, meaning the matter of the deposits has already been conclusively decided and cannot be decided again.

Page: 2

For this reason, the tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit and the pet damage deposit is dismissed without leave to reapply.

As the tenant was not successful in this application, I find that 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 and the pet damage deposit without 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: June 30, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch