



# 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 to obtain monetary compensation for the return of the security deposit (the deposit) and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

The tenant submitted two signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding forms which declare that on August 11, 2021, the tenant sent the landlords the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by e-mail.

### 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*?

### 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 tenant must prove they served the landlords with the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request and all documents in support of the application as per section 89 of the *Act*.

On the Proofs of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, the tenant has indicated they sent the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the landlords by e-mail. However, I find that the tenant has not provided a copy of the

outgoing e-mail(s) containing the Direct Request documents as attachments to confirm this service.

I also note that section 89 of the *Act* provides that a Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request 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 there is no evidence to demonstrate that the landlords indicated documents could be served by e-mail. I find the tenant has not demonstrated that the landlords’ e-mail address was provided for service of documents, as required by section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the landlords, which is a requirement of the Direct Request process.

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 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 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: August 27, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch