



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

The tenants submitted two signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on July 16, 2021, the tenants sent each of the landlords the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail. The tenants provided a copy of the Canada Post receipt containing the tracking numbers to confirm these mailings.

Based on the written submissions of the tenants and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the Direct Request Proceeding documents were served on July 16, 2021 and are deemed to have been received by the landlords on July 21, 2021, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

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*?

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 tenants submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A partial copy of a residential tenancy agreement, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,800.00, a security deposit of \$900.00, and a pet damage deposit of \$900.00, for a tenancy commencing on July 1, 2020
- A copy of an e-mail sent from the tenants to the landlords on June 3, 2021, providing the forwarding address
- A copy of a Tenant's Direct Request Worksheet showing the amount of the deposits paid by the tenants, a partial reimbursement of \$1,210.00, and indicating the tenancy ended on June 1, 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.

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 tenants have not submitted the last page of the tenancy agreement, where the signature of the landlords and tenants should appear. I also find the tenants have not submitted a copy of a Proof of Service of Forwarding Address form. Finally, I find the tenants have not signed the Tenant's Direct Request Worksheet.

I find that I am not able to consider the tenants' Application for Dispute Resolution without these complete documents which form a part of the Application.

Furthermore, section 88 of the *Act* provides that a forwarding address 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.”

I find that the tenants have served the forwarding address to the landlords by e-mail. However, I find there is no evidence to demonstrate that the landlords’ e-mail address was provided for service of documents, as required by section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*.

For these reasons, 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 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 and the pet damage 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: August 03, 2021

Residential Tenancy Branch