



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSD , FF

Introduction

A hearing was conducted by conference call in the presence of both parties. On the basis of the solemnly affirmed evidence presented at that hearing, a decision has been reached. All of the evidence was carefully considered.

Both parties were given a full opportunity to present evidence and make submissions. Neither party requested an adjournment or a Summons to Testify. Prior to concluding the hearing both parties acknowledged they had presented all of the relevant evidence that they wished to present.

I find that the Application for Dispute Resolution/Notice of Hearing was sufficiently served on the landlord as the landlord acknowledged receipt of the same. With respect to each of the applicant's claims I find as follows:

Issue(s) to be Decided

The issue to be decided is whether the tenant is entitled to the return of double the security deposit/pet deposit?

Background and Evidence

The parties entered into a tenancy agreement that provided that the tenancy would start on May 1, 2012. The rent was \$650 per month payable on first day of each month. The tenant(s) paid a security deposit of \$325 at the start of the tenancy. .

The tenancy ended on July 31, 2013.

The tenant(s) provided the landlord with her forwarding address in writing on July 4, 2013.

Analysis

Law

The Residential Tenancy Act provides that a landlord must return the security deposit plus interest to the tenants within 15 days of the later of the date the tenancy ends or the date the landlord receives the tenants forwarding address in writing unless the parties have agreed in writing that the landlord can retain the security deposit, the landlord already has a monetary order against the tenants or the landlord files an Application for Dispute Resolution within that 15 day period. It further provides that if the landlord fails to do this the tenant is entitled to an order for double the security deposit.

Analysis

The tenants paid a security deposit of \$325 prior to May 1, 2012. I determined the tenancy ended on July 31, 2013. I further determined the tenants provided the landlord with their forwarding address in writing on July 4, 2013. The parties have not agreed in writing that the landlord can retain the security deposit. The landlord does not have a monetary order against the tenants and the landlord failed to file an Application for Dispute Resolution within the 15 days from the later of the end of tenancy or the date the landlord receives the tenants' forwarding address in writing. As a result I determined the tenants have established a claim against the landlord for double the security deposit or the sum of \$650 ($\$325 \times 2 = \650)..

Monetary Order and Cost of Filing fee

I ordered the landlord(s) to pay to the tenant the sum of \$650.

It is further Ordered that this sum be paid forthwith. The applicant is given a formal Order in the above terms and the respondent must be served with a copy of this Order as soon as possible.

Should the respondent 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.

The landlord alleged that he had claims against the tenant for non-payment of rent and failure to clean. The landlord must first file an Application for Dispute Resolution before those claims can be considered.

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: October 21, 2013

Residential Tenancy Branch

