



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSD, MNDC, FF

Introduction

This hearing dealt with the tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution seeking a monetary order.

The hearing was conducted via teleconference and was attended by the tenant and his witness.

The tenant testified the landlord was served with the notice of hearing documents and this Application for Dispute Resolution, pursuant to Section 59(3) of the *Residential Tenancy Act (Act)* by registered mail and in person on September 28, 2015 in accordance with Section 89. Section 90 of the *Act* deems documents served in such a manner to be received on the 5th day after they have been mailed.

Based on the testimony of the tenant, I find that the landlord has been sufficiently served with the documents pursuant to the *Act*.

Issue(s) to be Decided

The issues to be decided are whether the tenant is entitled to a monetary order for return of double the security deposit and to recover the filing fee from the landlord for the cost of the Application for Dispute Resolution, pursuant to Sections 38, 67, and 72 of the *Act*.

Background and Evidence

The tenant testified the tenancy began in March 2013 as a series of 6 month fixed term tenancies for the monthly rent of \$600.00 due on the 1st of each month with a security deposit of \$300.00 paid.

The tenant submitted the tenancy ended on August 28, 2015 and that he provided his forwarding address on the same date to the landlord. The tenant submitted that he has not received his security deposit back from the landlord.

Analysis

Section 38(1) of the *Act* stipulates that a landlord must, within 15 days of the end of the tenancy and receipt of the tenant's forwarding address, either return the security deposit or file an Application for Dispute Resolution to claim against the security deposit. Section 38(6) stipulates that should the landlord fail to comply with Section 38(1) the landlord must pay the tenant double the security deposit.

Based on the tenant's undisputed testimony I find the tenancy ended on August 28, 2015 and that the tenant provided the landlord with his forwarding address on the same day. Therefore, I find the landlord had until September 13, 2015 to file an Application for Dispute Resolution seeking to claim against the deposit. I have no evidence before me that the landlord has done so.

As such, I find the landlord has failed to comply with their obligations under Section 38(1) and the as a result the tenant is entitled to double the amount of the deposit, pursuant to Section 38(6).

Conclusion

I find the tenant is entitled to monetary compensation pursuant to Section 67 and I grant a monetary order in the amount of **\$650.00** comprised of \$600.00 double the security deposit and the \$50.00 fee paid by the tenant for this application.

This order must be served on the landlord. If the landlord fails to comply with this order the tenant may file the order in the Provincial Court (Small Claims) and be 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: April 11, 2016

Residential Tenancy Branch