



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

### 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 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 find 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.

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.*"

On March 1, 2021, section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation* was updated to provide 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.*"

Policy Guideline #12 on Service Provisions provides that *“if there has been a history of communication between parties by email, but a party has not specifically provided an email address for service purposes, it is not advisable to use email as a service method.”*

The tenants have indicated they sent the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the landlord by e-mail.

The tenants have submitted a copy of e-mails from the landlord received prior to March 1, 2021. However, I find that the landlord cannot have agreed to use a method of service in accordance with legislation that did not yet exist.

I find the tenants have failed to demonstrate that the landlord specifically provided their e-mail address for service of documents, in accordance with section 43(2) of the *Residential Tenancy Regulation*.

I find I am not able to confirm service of the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the landlord 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 the tenants are not entitled to recover the 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: September 07, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch