



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      MNSD, FFT

### Introduction

This hearing dealt with the Tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution filed under the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the "*Act*"). The Tenant applied for the return of her security deposit, and to recover her filing fee. The matter was set for a conference call.

The Tenant attended the hearing and was affirmed to be truthful in their testimony. As the Landlord did not attend the hearing, service of the Notice of Dispute Resolution Hearing was considered. Section 59 of the *Act* states that the respondent must be served with a copy of the Application for Dispute Resolution and Notice of Hearing. The Tenant testified that they personally served the Application for Dispute Resolution to the Landlord, on January 30, 2020. I find that the Landlord has been duly served in accordance with the *Act*.

The Tenant was provided with 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. However, only the evidence relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this Decision.

### Issues to be Decided

- Has there been a breach of Section 38 of the *Act* by the Landlord?
- Is the Tenant entitled to the return of her security deposit?
- Is the Tenant entitled to recover the filing fee for this application?

### Background and Evidence

While I have turned my mind to all of the accepted documentary evidence and the testimony of the parties, only the details of the respective submissions and/or arguments relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are reproduced here.

The Tenant testified that the tenancy began on August 1, 2013, that rent in the amount of \$1,425.00 was to be paid by the first day of each month and that the Tenant paid the Landlord a \$700.00 security deposit at the outset of this tenancy. The Tenant also testified their tenancy and moved out as of January 4, 2020.

The Tenant testified that they provided the Landlord with their forwarding address by a letter that they served to the Landlord the same day that they returned the keys to the rental unit and conducted the move-out inspection, on January 10, 2020.

The Tenant confirmed that they had not been served with an Application for Dispute Resolution claiming against the deposit by the Landlord.

### Analysis

Based on the testimony, the documentary evidence before me, and on a balance of probabilities, I find as follows:

Section 38(1) of the *Act* gives the landlord 15 days from the later of the day the tenancy ends or the date the landlord receives the tenant's forwarding address in writing to file an Application for Dispute Resolution claiming against the deposits or repay the security deposit and pet damage deposit to the tenant.

#### ***Return of security deposit and pet damage deposit***

**38 (1)** *Except as provided in subsection (3) or (4) (a), within 15 days after the later of*

*(a) the date the tenancy ends, and*

*(b) the date the landlord receives the tenant's forwarding address in writing,*

*the landlord must do one of the following:*

*(c) repay, as provided in subsection (8), any security deposit or pet damage deposit to the tenant with interest calculated in accordance with the regulations;*

*(d) make an application for dispute resolution claiming against the security deposit or pet damage deposit.*

I accept the testimony of the Tenant, and find that this tenancy ended on January 10, 2020, the day the Tenant return the keys to the rental unit and conducted the moved-out inspection with the Landlord. I also accept the testimony of the Tenant that they provided their forward address to the Landlord, on the same day as the move-out inspection.

Accordingly, the Landlord had until January 27, 2020, the first business day after the statutory timeline expired, to comply with section 38(1) of the *Act* by either repaying the deposits in full to the Tenant or submitting an Application for Dispute resolution to claim against the deposits. The Landlord, in this case, did neither.

At no time does a landlord have the right 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, in writing, to the repayment of the security deposit or that deductions be made, 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 thinks they are entitled to keep even a small portion of the deposit, based on unproven claims.

I find that the Landlord breached section 38 (1) of the *Act* by not returning the Tenant's security deposit or filing a claim against the deposit within the statutory timeline.

Section 38 (6) of the *Act* goes on to state that if the landlord does not comply with the requirement to return or apply to retain the deposit within the 15 days, the landlord must pay the tenant double the security deposit.

***Return of security deposit and pet damage deposit***

***38 (6) If a landlord does not comply with subsection (1), the landlord***  
*(a) may not make a claim against the security deposit or any pet damage deposit, and*  
*(b) must pay the tenant double the amount of the security deposit, pet damage deposit, or both, as applicable.*

Therefore, I find that pursuant to section 38(6) of the *Act*, the Tenant has successfully proven that they are entitled to the return of double their security deposit. I find for the

Tenants, in the amount of \$1,400.00, granting a monetary order for the return of double the security deposit for this tenancy.

Section 72 of the *Act* gives me the authority to order the repayment of a fee for an application for dispute resolution. As the Tenants have been successful in their application, I find that the Tenants are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

### Conclusion

I find that the Landlord breached section 38 of the *Act* when they failed to repay or make a claim against the security deposit and pet damage deposit as required by the *Act*.

I find for the Tenant pursuant to sections 38 and 72 of the *Act*. I grant the Tenant a **Monetary Order** in the amount of **\$1,500.00**. The Tenant is provided with this Order in the above terms, and the Landlord must be served with this Order as soon as possible. Should the Landlord fail to comply with this Order, this 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: June 19, 2020

---

Residential Tenancy Branch