

DECISION

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 the tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution (Application) for:

- a Monetary Order for the return of all or a portion of their security deposit pursuant to sections 38 and 67 of the Act (\$1,250.00)
- authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the landlord pursuant to section 72 of the Act (\$100.00)

Service of Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request

The tenant submitted one signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that the landlords were served with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request (Proceeding Package) by registered mail.

The tenant submitted a copy of one envelope containing one Canada Post tracking number to confirm this service.

Issue(s) to be decided

Is the tenant entitled to a Monetary Order for the return of all or a portion of their security deposit? (\$1,250.00)

Is the tenant entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the landlord? (\$100.00)

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 indicated on the Notice as per section 89 of the Act.

The tenant must also prove that they served each landlord with the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request in a manner that is considered necessary as per section 71(2)(a) of the Act.

Policy Guideline #12 on Service Provisions provides the following requirement:

“Important: all parties named on an application for dispute resolution must receive notice of the proceedings. Where more than one party is named on an application, each party must be served separately.”

I find that the envelope submitted by the tenant shows that the tenant has placed both Proceeding Packages in the same envelope with multiple persons named. In an *ex parte* hearing, I find that I am not able to confirm service of the Notices of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to each of the parties individually as required by sections 71 and 89 of the Act.

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

The tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of all or a portion of their security deposit, pursuant to sections 38 and 67 of the Act, is dismissed with leave to reapply.

The tenant's application for authorization to recover the filing fee for this application from the landlord, pursuant to section 72 of the Act, is dismissed 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: November 15, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch