



# 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 a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on March 15, 2022, the tenant sent the landlord the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by registered mail and 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 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*.

The tenant submitted a copy of a Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding indicating that the Direct Request documents were served to the landlord on March 15, 2022.

However, I find the tenant didn't file their Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request until March 17, 2022 and that the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding – Direct Request was not made available for service until March 23, 2022.

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 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: May 03, 2022

---

Residential Tenancy Branch