



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSD, FF

Introduction

This is an application by the tenant for a monetary order for return of double the security deposit and the filing fee for the claim.

Although served with the Application for Dispute Resolution and Notice of Hearing by registered mail sent on July 13, 2012, a Canada post tracking number was provided as evidence of service, the landlord did not appear.

Section 90 of the Act determines that a document served in this manner is deemed to have been served five days later. I find that the landlord has been duly served in accordance with the Act.

The tenant appeared, gave affirmed testimony and was provided the opportunity to present their evidence orally and in written and documentary form, and to make submissions at the hearing.

I have reviewed all evidence and testimony before me that met the requirements of the rules of procedure. I refer only to the relevant facts and issues in this decision.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant entitled to a monetary order for return of double the security deposit?

Background and Evidence

The tenant paid a security deposit of \$287.50 on May 1, 2011. The tenant vacated the premises on May 31, 2012. On June 14, 2012, the tenant placed in the landlord's mailbox, which was witnessed, a written notice of his forwarding address to return the security deposit to. The tenant did not sign over a portion of the security deposit. Filed in evidence is a copy of the signed tenancy agreement. Filed in evidence is the written notice dated June 14, 2012.

Analysis

Based on the above, the testimony and evidence, and on a balance of probabilities, I find that the landlord is in breach of the Act.

There was no evidence to show that the tenant had agreed, in writing, that the landlord could retain any portion of the security deposit.

There was also no evidence to show that the landlord had applied for arbitration, within 15 days of the end of the tenancy or receipt of the forwarding address of the tenant, to retain a portion of the security deposit, plus interest.

The landlord has breached section 38 of the Act. The landlord is in the business of renting and therefore, has a duty to abide by the laws pertaining to residential tenancies.

The security deposit is held in trust for the tenant by the landlord. At no time does the landlord have the ability to simply keep the security deposit because they feel they are entitled to it or are justified to keep it.

The landlord may only keep all or a portion of the security deposit through the authority of the Act, such as an order from a Dispute Resolution Officer. Here the landlord did not have any authority under the Act to keep any portion of the security deposit. Therefore, I find that the landlord is not entitled to retain any portion of the security deposit or interest.

Section 38(6) provides that if a landlord does not comply with section 38(1), the landlord must pay the tenant double the amount of the security deposit. The legislation does not provide any flexibility on this issue.

Conclusion

Having made the above findings, I must order, pursuant to section 38 and 67 of the Act, that the landlord pays the tenant the sum of \$625.00, comprised of double the security deposit (\$287.50) and the \$50.00 fee for filing this Application.

The tenant is given a formal order in the above terms and the landlord must be served with a copy of this order as soon as possible. Should the landlord fail to comply with this order, the order may be filed in the small claims division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an order of that court.

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 17, 2012.

Residential Tenancy Branch