

Dispute Resolution Services

Residential Tenancy Branch Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSDB-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 double the security deposit and the pet damage deposit (the deposits) and to recover the filing fee paid for the application.

This decision is written based on the Application for Dispute Resolution, evidence, and submissions provided by the tenant on December 7, 2021.

The tenant submitted a signed Proof of Service Tenant's Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on December 8, 2021, the tenant sent the landlord the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request by e-mail. The tenant provided a copy of the outgoing e-mail containing the Direct Request documents as attachments to confirm this service.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant entitled to monetary compensation for the return of a security deposit and a pet damage 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*?

<u>Analysis</u>

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*.

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 that the tenant has sent the Notice of Dispute Resolution Proceeding - Direct Request to the landlord by e-mail. However, I find there is no evidence to demonstrate that the landlord indicated documents could be served by e-mail.

I find the tenant has not demonstrated that the landlord's 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 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 and the pet damage deposit is dismissed with leave to reapply.

As the tenant was not successful in this application, I find the tenant is not entitled to recover the filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

I dismiss the tenant's application for a Monetary Order for the return of the security deposit and the pet damage 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: January 12, 2022

Residential Tenancy Branch