



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.

The tenants submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on June 8, 2022, the tenants served the landlord the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by handing the documents to Person E.T. The tenants had Person E.T. sign the Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form to confirm personal service.

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 an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, the onus is on the tenants 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 tenants 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 tenants must prove that 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* which permits service by leaving a copy with the landlord or an agent of the landlord.

On the Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding form the tenants have indicated they served the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to Person E.T. However, I find there is no indication or documentation in the evidence demonstrating that Person E.T. is the landlord's agent.

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

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 \$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 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: June 29, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch