



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

DECISION

Dispute Codes MNSDB-DR, FFT

Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 38.1 of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the *Act*), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the tenant for a Monetary Order seeking the return of her security deposit and pet damage deposit (collectively, the “deposits”).

The tenant submitted a signed “Proof of Service of the Tenant’s Notice of Direct Request Proceeding” form which declares that on June 21, 2020 the tenant served the landlord with the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding, along with copies of supporting documents, via email. The tenants provided a copy of the June 21, 2020 email message addressed the landlord. The email message included file attachments which the tenants asserts contained the Direct Request Proceeding documents. The tenant also provided history of recent email correspondence with the landlord.

On March 30, 2020, the Executive Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch (“RTB”) authorized a *Director’s Order* which, pursuant to sections 71(2)(b) and (c) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*, orders that until the declaration of the state of emergency made under the *Emergency Program Act* on March 18, 2020 is cancelled or expires without being extended:

a document of the type described in section 88 or 89 of the Residential Tenancy Act has been sufficiently given or served for the purposes of the Act if the document is given or served on the person in one of the following ways:

- *the document is emailed to the email address of the person to whom the document is to be given or served, and that person confirms receipt of the*

document by way of return email in which case the document is deemed to have been received on the date the person confirms receipt;

- the document is emailed to the email address of the person to whom the document is to be given or served, and that person responds to the email without identifying an issue with the transmission or viewing of the document, or with their understanding of the document, in which case the document is deemed to have been received on the date the person responds; or*
- the document is emailed to the email address that the person to whom the document is to be given or served has routinely used to correspond about tenancy matters from an email address that the person giving or serving the document has routinely used for such correspondence, in which case the document is deemed to have been received three days after it was emailed*

Based on the written submissions of the landlord, and pursuant to the above-noted *Director's Order*, and pursuant to sections 71(2)(b) and (c) of the Act, I find that the landlord is deemed to have received the Direct Request Proceeding documents on June 24, 2020, three days after they were sent to the landlord by the tenant by way of email.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Is the tenant entitled to a monetary award for the return of all or a portion of her security deposit pursuant to section 38 of the Act? If so, should it be doubled?

Is the tenant entitled to a monetary award for the return of all or a portion of her pet damage deposit pursuant to section 38 of the Act? If so, should it be doubled?

Is the tenant entitled to recover the filing fee for this application from the landlord pursuant to section 72 of the Act?

Background and Evidence

I have reviewed all written submissions and evidence before me; however, only the evidence and submissions relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

On the tenant's Application for Dispute Resolution by Direct Request (the "application"), the tenant has requested a Monetary Order seeking a return of her security deposit and pet damage deposit in the amount of \$8,300.00.

On the application, the tenant attested that tenancy ended on April 30, 2020, the date on which the tenant vacated the rental unit, subsequent to a tenant's notice to end the tenancy.

The tenant submitted, in part, the following evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by the landlord and the tenant, indicating a monthly rent of \$5,500.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on April 15, 2019. The tenancy agreement depicts that the tenant was required to pay a security deposit in the amount of \$2,500.00 and a pet damage deposit of \$2,500.00, which were paid on April 14, 2019;
- A copy of a Tenant's Monetary Order Worksheet for an Expedited Return of Security Deposit and/or Pet Damage Deposit (the Monetary Order Worksheet) showing the amount of the security deposit and pet damage deposit paid by the tenant and the amount sought in return by the tenant. The tenant asserts that she authorized the landlord to retain a total of \$850.00 from the deposits but did not agree to any authorized deduction from either the security deposit or pet damage deposit beyond that amount, and also states that there is no authorized deduction previously granted by an arbitrator permitting the landlord to retain any amount of the security deposit or pet damage deposit. The tenant attested that she is not aware of any monetary order made against the security deposit or pet damage deposit and is not aware of any monetary order for the tenant to pay an amount to the landlord that remains unpaid. The tenant stated that the landlord returned a partial amount of the pet damage deposit, in the amount \$248.17; the tenants seek the return of the balance of the pet damage deposit in the amount of \$1,650.00, which the tenant states is being held by the landlord with her consent and also seeks the full return of the security deposit in the amount of \$2,500.00.

On the Monetary Order Worksheet, the tenant provides that she and the landlord participated in both a move-in condition inspection and a move-out condition inspection. The tenant asserted that she was provided a copy of the condition inspection report subsequent to both the move-in condition inspection and the move-out condition

inspection. The tenant submitted copies of both the move-in condition inspection report and move-out condition inspection report as evidence. The move-out condition inspection report depicts that the tenant authorized the landlord to retain \$850.00 from the deposits.

The tenant attested that she provided her forwarding address in writing to the landlord during the move-out condition inspection held on April 30, 2020. The tenant stated that on April 30, 2020, her forwarding address was provided to the landlord by having it written on the move-out condition inspection report, dated April 30, 2020, during the move-out condition inspection.

The tenant also provided a copy of a "Proof of Service Tenant Forwarding Address for the Return of Security and/or Pet Damage Deposit form" (Proof of Service of the Forwarding Address) which depicts that the tenant provided her forwarding address to the landlord which was written on the condition inspection report during the move-out condition inspection conducted on April 30, 2020.

Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence provided by the tenant. I find that in accordance with section 88 of the *Act* the landlord was duly served with the tenant's forwarding address on April 30, 2020, the date on which the tenant provided her forwarding address to the landlord by having it written on the condition inspection report during the move-out condition inspection conducted on April 30, 2020.

I accept the following declarations made by the tenant on the Monetary Order Worksheet:

- With the exception of permitting the landlord to retain \$850.00 from the pet damage deposit, the tenant has not provided consent for the landlord to keep all or part of the security deposit or the balance of the pet damage deposit.
- There are no outstanding Monetary Orders against the tenant for this tenancy; and
- The tenant has not extinguished her right to the security deposit in accordance with sections 24(1) and 36(1) of the *Act*.

Based on the declarations provided by the tenant, I find that the landlord did not have the tenant's written consent to retain any portion of the security deposit and had consent to retain only \$850.00 from the pet damage deposit.

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the tenant paid a security deposit in the amount of \$2,500.00 and a pet damage deposit in the amount of \$2,500.00 as indicated in the tenancy agreement.

I accept the tenant's statement on the Monetary Order Worksheet that the tenancy ended on April 30, 2020, the date on which the tenant vacated the rental unit.

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 or pet damage deposit through the authority of the Act, such as an order from an arbitrator, or the written agreement of the tenant.

Section 38(1) of the Act requires the landlord to either return a tenant's security deposit and/or pet damage deposit in full or file for dispute resolution for authorization to retain the deposit(s) 15 days after the *later* of the end of a tenancy, or upon receipt of the tenant's forwarding address in writing.

If that does not occur, the landlord is required to pay a monetary award, pursuant to section 38(6)(b) of the Act, equivalent to double the value of the security deposit and/or the pet damage deposit. There are exceptions to this outlined in sections 38(2) to 38(4) of the Act. A landlord may also under sections 38(3) and 38(4) retain a tenant's security or pet deposit if an order to do so has been issued by an arbitrator or if the tenant agrees in writing that the landlord may retain the amount to pay a liability or obligation of the tenant.

Based on the declarations provided by the tenant, I find that the rights of the tenant to seek the return of her security deposit and pet damage deposit have not been extinguished.

I find that the landlord did not adhere to the requirements of section 38(1) of the Act, as the landlord did not return the security deposit in the amount of \$2,500.00 and the pet damage deposit of \$1,650.00, as requested by the tenant, within 15 days of April 30, 2020 (the date on which the landlord received the tenant's forwarding address and the date on which the tenancy ended).

There is no evidence before me to show that the landlord applied for dispute resolution claiming against the security deposit or pet damage deposit within 15 days following the conclusion of the tenancy or after receiving the tenant's forwarding address.

I find that there is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the landlord received the tenant's written authorization to retain all, or a portion of either the security deposit to offset damages or losses arising out of the tenancy as per section 38(4)(a) of the Act, nor did the landlord receive an order from an Arbitrator enabling it to do so.

I find that there is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the landlord received the tenant's written authorization to retain any portion of the balance of the pet damage deposit, in the amount of \$1,650.00, apart from the \$850.00 deduction authorized by the tenant, in order to offset damages or losses arising out of the tenancy as per section 38(4)(a) of the Act, nor did the landlord receive an order from an Arbitrator enabling her to do so.

Section 38(6) of the Act sets out what is to occur in the event that a landlord fails to return or claim the security deposit within the specified timeframe:

- (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.

Pursuant to section 38(6)(b) of the Act, a landlord is required to pay a monetary award equivalent to double the value of the security deposit if a landlord does not comply with the provisions of section 38 of the Act. I find that the landlord failed to adhere to section 38(1) of the Act.

The language of section 38(6)(b) is mandatory. As the landlord has failed to comply with section 38(1), I must order that the landlord pay the tenant double the amount of the security deposit and unreturned portion of the pet damage deposit.

Residential Tenancy Policy Guideline 17 states that "unless the tenant has specifically waived the doubling of the deposit, either on an application for the return of the deposit or at the hearing, the arbitrator will order the return of double the deposit." However, the tenant has not provided any such waiver; therefore the provisions of section 38(6)(b) must be applied.

The tenant is therefore entitled to a monetary award in the amount of \$7,803.66, representing a doubling of the tenant's unreturned security deposit [\$2,500.00 x 2], and

a doubling of the tenant's unreturned pet damage deposit, which accounts for the authorized deduction of \$850.00 permitted by the tenant and the partial amount of \$248.17 already returned by the landlord $[(\$2,500.00 - \$850.00 - \$248.17) \times 2]$.

As the tenant was successful in this application, I find that the tenant is entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

Conclusion

Pursuant to sections 38, 67, and 72 of the Act, I issue a Monetary Order in the tenant's favour in the amount of \$7,903.66 against the landlord, calculated as follows:

Item	Amount
Doubling of unreturned Security Deposit ($\$2,500.00 \times 2$)	\$5,000.00
Doubling of unreturned Pet Damage Deposit ($\$2,500.00 - \$850.00 - \$248.17 = \$1,401.83$) $\times 2 = \$2,803.66$	\$2,803.66
Recovery of Filing Fee	\$100.00
Total Monetary Award to Tenant	\$7,903.66

The tenant is provided with a Monetary Order in the above terms and the landlord must be served with this Order as soon as possible. Should the landlord(s) 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 25, 2020

Residential Tenancy Branch