



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSD, FF

Introduction

This hearing dealt with an Application by the Tenant for a monetary order for return of double the security deposit paid to the Landlord and for the return of the filing fee for the Application.

Both parties appeared at the hearing. The hearing process was explained and the participants were asked if they had any questions. Both parties provided affirmed testimony and were provided the opportunity to present their evidence orally and in written and documentary form, and to cross-examine the other party, and make submissions to me.

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

Issue to be Decided

Has there been a breach of Section 38 of the Act by the Landlord?

Background and Evidence

The Tenant paid the Landlord a security deposit of \$650.00 on or about December 1, 2009. The Tenant vacated the premises on July 31, 2014.

The parties agreed that the Tenant provided the Landlord with a written notice of the forwarding address to return the security deposit to. The Tenant did not sign over a portion of the security deposit.

The parties agreed that a move in inspection was done on December 1, 2009 and the move out inspection was done on August 1, 2014.

The Landlord claimed the Tenant owed \$200.00 for utilities, \$180.00 for carpet cleaning and \$20.00 for cleaning the stove. The Landlord did not provide any evidence to support these claims, stating that he did not believe he was required to submit any evidence. He also testified that he only just received receipts for the utilities and that he did not have a receipt for the carpet cleaning.

On August 18, 2014, the Landlord returned only \$60.00 of the Tenant's security deposit. The Landlord claimed the Tenant verbally agreed to this. The Tenant denies such an agreement.

Analysis

Based on the above, the testimony and evidence, and on a balance of probabilities, I find that the Landlord is in breach of section 38 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, as required under section 38.

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. If the Landlord and the Tenant are unable to agree to the repayment of the security deposit or to deductions to be made to it, the Landlord must file an Application for Dispute Resolution within 15 days of the end of the tenancy or receipt of the forwarding address, whichever is later.

It is not enough that the Landlord feel they are entitled to keep the deposit, based on unproven claims.

The Landlord may only keep all or a portion of the security deposit through the authority of the Act, such as an order from an Arbitrator, or with the written agreement of the

Tenant. 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.

I note that the Landlord submitted evidence about the condition of the rental unit after the Tenant left; however, the Landlord is unable to make a monetary claim through the Tenants' Application. The Landlord has to file their own Application to keep the deposit with the 15 days of certain events, as explained above.

The Landlord may still file an application for alleged rent and alleged damages; however, the issue of the security deposit has now been conclusively dealt with in this hearing.

Having made the above findings, I must Order, pursuant to section 38 and 67 of the Act, that the Landlord pay the Tenant the sum of **\$1,230.00**, comprised of double the balance of the security deposit (2 x \$590.00) and the \$50.00 fee for filing this Application.

Conclusion

The Tenant are given a formal Monetary 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 final and binding on the parties, except as otherwise provided under the Act, and 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: February 16, 2015

Residential Tenancy Branch

