

## Contents

Contents.....	1
s. 7 - Publication.....	4
Gender Identity and Expression; Sexual Orientation.....	4
Religion; Marital Status; Sexual Orientation; Place of Origin .....	5
s. 8 - Accommodation, Service and Facility.....	6
Age .....	6
Family Status.....	6
Marital Status.....	8
Mental Disability .....	8
Physical Disability.....	13
Place of Origin.....	23
Race.....	24
Religion .....	28
Sex (Gender).....	29
Sexual Orientation .....	31
s. 9 – Purchase of Property .....	33
Marital Status.....	33
Physical Disability.....	33
Sexual Orientation; Physical Disability.....	34
s. 10 – Tenancy Premises .....	34
Age .....	34
Family Status.....	34

Gender Identity or Expression ..... 36

Mental Disability ..... 36

Physical Disability..... 38

Race; Ancestry, Place of Origin, Religion ..... 42

Sex (Harassment) ..... 42

Sex (Pregnancy)..... 43

Sexual Orientation ..... 44

Source of Income ..... 44

s. 12 – Wages ..... 46

    Sex (Gender)..... 46

S. 13 - Employment ..... 46

    Age ..... 46

    Criminal Conviction ..... 48

    Family Status ..... 49

    Marital Status..... 51

    Mental Disability ..... 51

    Physical Disability..... 60

    Political Belief..... 87

    Race..... 88

    Religion ..... 98

    Gender Identity and Expression; Sexual Orientation..... 99

    Sexual Orientation ..... 100

    Sex (Gender)..... 100

    Sex (Harassment) ..... 104

Sex (Pregnancy)..... 118

s. 14 – Unions and Associations..... 126

    Mental Disability ..... 126

    Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin ..... 128

s. 37(4) – Costs ..... 128

s. 43 – Retaliation..... 153

**Legend:**

C = Complainant  
R = Respondent  
I2D = Injury to Dignity  
LW = Lost Wages

Complaints alleging more than one ground of discrimination are grouped under the heading for the primary ground alleged.

Area	Ground	Citation	Summary	Award
<b>s. 7 - Publication</b>				
<b>Gender Identity and Expression; Sexual Orientation</b>				
<b>s. 7 (also s. 13)</b>	<b>Gender Identity and Expression; Sexual Orientation</b>	<i>Chilliwack Teachers' Association v. Neufeld (No. 10), <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 49</a></i>  <i>Chilliwack Teachers' Association v. Neufeld (No. 11), <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 50</a></i>	The Cs were LGBTQ teachers. The R was a school board trustee. R published hate speech on Facebook, in an interview, and in a newsletter that tended to expose LGBTQ people to detestation and vilification based on their identities and had the potential to lead to discriminatory treatment. R also made 24 publications setting out his view that LGBTQ people, especially trans people, should be discriminated against in the public school system. These publications were found to indicate discrimination or an intention to discriminate in public education.	I2D: \$750,000 to be distributed equally among members of the class, resulting in individual awards of between \$4,601.23 to \$16,666.67.  LW: \$442 for one teacher for wages lost in order to attend the hearing  Costs: \$10,000 for improper conduct throughout the Tribunal's process.  (pre and post-judgement interest on I2D)

[Back to Top](#)

s. 7	<b>Gender Identity and Expression</b>	<i>Oger v. Whatcott (No. 7)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 58</a>	R published and distributed a flyer entitled “Transgenderism vs Truth”, denying C’s identity as a transgender woman and seeking to influence people not to vote for her in an upcoming provincial election. R is a Christian activist and believes that gender is static. The panel found R’s flyer demonstrated an intention to discriminate and was likely to expose C and other transgender people to hatred and contempt.	I2D: \$35,000  Costs: \$20,000 for R’s improper conduct throughout hearing. (pre and post-judgement interest on I2D and costs until paid in full).
s. 7	<b>Gender Identity and Expression</b>	<i>Li v. Brown</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 228</a>	C rented a suite in a house owned by R and his husband. C was not open about his sexual orientation at work and R knew this. C began making what R’s husband took to be inappropriate advances towards R. The relationship between R and C became strained as R sought access to suite for showings. C alleged R repeatedly threatened to “out” him at work unless he complied. C ended tenancy and there was a dispute over damage deposit. R responded by showing C’s supervisor a picture of C wearing a dress, effectively “outing” him. HRT found discrimination under s.7 but dismissed complaint under s.10.	I2D: \$5,000
<b>Religion; Marital Status; Sexual Orientation; Place of Origin</b>				

s. 7	<b>Religion; Marital Status; Sexual Orientation; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Dahlquist-Gray and another v. Hedley (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 50</a>	R published posters that were found to have discriminated against Cs on basis of place of origin (USA), religion (Wiccan), marital status and sexual orientation (married gay couple).	I2D: \$5,000 to each C  Costs: \$1,000 against R to each C for inappropriate communication with the Tribunal despite repeated warnings
<b>s. 8 - Accommodation, Service and Facility</b>				
<b>Age</b>				
s. 8	<b>Age</b>	<i>LeGates and another v. 4373006 Canada Inc. dba North Island Kayak and another</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 131</a>	Cs were both in their 70s and had been kayaking for decades. R denied Cs and their grandchildren kayaking service, specifically referring to Cs' age, among other considerations. R offered alternatives, but they were not comparable. Tribunal found discrimination based on age.	I2D: \$2,000 for each C
<b>Family Status</b>				
s. 8	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Students (by Parent) v. Daycare Provider (No.3)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 84</a>	One of the Students might have contracted Hand, Foot, and Mouth Disease, which led to disputes between the Students' parents and R Daycare regarding a possible outbreak presumably caused by the Student. The Daycare later expelled the Students without citing any reason. The tribunal found that the expulsion was due to the Daycare's dispute with the parents, which was discrimination against the Students based on family status. The Daycare failed to provide	I2D: \$2,000 and \$500 for students  Expenses: \$2,000 for parent representative's lost wages to attend hearing.

			reasonable accommodation by trying to resolve the dispute first.	
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Ellis v. Snow Trails Sales and Service and Meiorin (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 152</a>	C not allowed to bring baby stroller into store. Happened numerous times.	I2D: \$5,000
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Fraser v. ING Insurance Co.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 163</a>	Foster mother was denied renewal of her home insurance when a foster child caused damage to the home. C had a secondary insurance policy for damage caused by the child. The insurer considered this a “red flag” and did not make inquiries into the reason for it.	I2D: \$1,000
<b>s. 8 (also s. 13)</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Hutchinson v. B.C. (Min. of Health)</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 58</a>  Judicial Review – <i>HMTQ v. Hutchinson et al</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCSC 1421</a> : BCHRT decision upheld	C with cerebral palsy and her father filed on the grounds that R’s caregiver funding prevented C from hiring her father for the role, without an assessment of their individual circumstances. The Tribunal found that R could have accommodated Cs by allowing for exceptions to its blanket prohibition against hiring family members.	I2D: Ms. Hutchinson \$8,500 (asked for \$10,000); Mr. Hutchinson \$4,000 (asked for \$6,000)  LW: \$105,840 for second C to compensate for his lost opportunity to be hired as his daughter’s caregiver  Order that the ministry develop criteria to allow exceptions to the blanket prohibition on the hiring of family members as caretakers  Order that first C be allowed the opportunity to hire her father by application of the criteria for exceptions to her case

				once made generally applicable to the public
<b>Marital Status</b>				
s.8	<b>Marital Status</b>	<i>Jackson v. Summerland Motel and others</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 120</a>	C was terminated from her employment because of her perceived marital-like relationship with an individual who the Rs considered to be of dubious character.	I2D: \$3,500  LW: \$499.20 and pre and post judgement interest
s.8	<b>Marital Status</b>	<i>Bray v. Shearwater Marine and another</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 64</a>	Wife denied access to businesses and other services in “company town” for 3 months after husband disputed a bill with R company. R owned virtually all the services on Denny Island where the complainant intended to live.	I2D: \$2,000  LW: \$1,337.33 to attend the hearing
<b>Mental Disability</b>				
s. 8	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>The Pharmacist v. College of Pharmacists of British Columbia and Dr. Mandy Manak</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 291</a>	C was a pharmacist registered with R College. Due to a substance use disorder, C voluntarily suspended his pharmacist license. He was prescribed Suboxone (an opiate agonist therapy) for substance use treatment. He requested reinstatement of his license and had a mandatory IME with R doctor, who told C that pharmacists could not be on Suboxone due to their safety-sensitive work. The College denied C’s reinstatement based on the doctor’s recommendation. C later obtained a favourable opinion from another specialist, which led the	I2D: \$7,500  LW (to attend hearing): \$349.61  Expenses (to attend hearing): \$329.18

			College to agree to reinstatement. The Tribunal found that R doctor made discriminatory comments resting on stereotypes related to C's substance use in her IME report to the College, though her recommendation was not tainted by discrimination. The Tribunal also found that the College's refusal of reinstatement was justified in accordance with its statutory standards.	
s. 8	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Student (by Parent) v. School District</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 237</a>	C has an anxiety disorder and trichotillomania. In grade 8, the R school district placed C in a Language 10 class. C found the class challenging and received lower grades. Her disabilities also worsened that year. Next year C did well in Language 11 with a different teacher and learning plan. The Tribunal found that R's decision to place C in Language 10 was not discriminatory. However, when R became aware of the impacts school was having on C's mental health, it had a duty to accommodate her, which it did not fulfill. The R's lack of inquiry and accommodation had an adverse impact on C's disabilities and was not reasonable.	I2D: \$5,000

s. 8	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Hayes v. DW Johnson Holdings Ltd. and others</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 143</a>	C has PTSD which he acquired as an RCMP officer. He was twice ejected and later banned from R pub for rolling marijuana cigarettes in the dining area. Tribunal found that C needed to prepare his medical cannabis in real time to meet his disability-related needs, and R's conduct was discriminatory. Tribunal found that the alternative of rolling the cigarettes in the bathroom would perpetuate the stigma around medical cannabis.	I2D: \$10,000
S. 8	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Hayes v. Blue Marlin Inn</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 61</a>	C has PTSD which he acquired as an RCMP officer. He has a prescription for medical cannabis to treat his PTSD. C attempted to roll a cannabis cigarette at his table at R pub. His server objected to him having cannabis at the premises. R then refused to serve him, called the police, ejected him from the premises, and banned him from service. R's treatment had a clear nexus with C's disabilities and R did not attempt to justify it.	I2D: \$2,500
s. 8	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Hayes v. 8899 Holdings Ltd. Dba the Port Spots Pub and others</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 165</a>	C was a retired member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) who had post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). He was prescribed cannabis to manage his symptoms. He was kicked out of the R's pub and refused service after an employee saw him rolling a	I2D: \$500 (individual employee), \$1,000 (Pub)  Pub is required to share informational documents on cannabis use and human Rights in BC with its employees.

			cannabis cigarette inside. This experience damaged C's reputation and induced stress, anxiety, and sleeplessness. Both the Pub and the employee were ordered to compensate C.	
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Daughter by Parent v. The Owners, A Strata</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 105</a>	14yo C had physical and mental health disabilities related to childhood trauma. She experienced escalating symptoms that a doctor agreed would be aided by owning a dog. R's bylaws did not allow dogs; C asked strata for an exemption and was denied. Tribunal found the no-dog bylaw violated <i>Code</i> given the significant adverse affect not having the dog would have on C.	C did not seek damages.  No-dog bylaw unenforceable against C.
<b>s. 8 (also s. 13)</b>	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Kelly v. UBC (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 32</a> (merits); <i>Kelly v. University of British Columbia (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 302</a> (remedy)  Judicial Review – <i>University of British Columbia v. Kelly</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCSC 1731</a> : injury to dignity award set aside and reconsideration ordered  Appeal – <i>University of British Columbia v. Kelly</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCCA 271</a> : award restored	C was a resident doctor who was entitled to the reasonable accommodation of his learning disabilities within the learning (UBC Medical School) and work environment (UBC Hospital). The decisions to preclude C access to further remediation or probation, and to dismiss him from the program were discriminatory.	I2D: \$75,000  LW: \$380,000

s. 8	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>J and J obo R v. B.C. (Ministry of Children and Family Development) and Havens (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 61</a>	MCFD refused to provide C's son, who has Noonan Syndrome, with support services for social and community development skills because his IQ was over 70. Support services were only provided to children with Noonan Syndrome if they had an IQ of 70 or lower, but support services were not withheld from other children with other "chronic mental health problems", such as Autism, who had an IQ over 70.	I2D: \$20,000  Order that R compensate C for loss for services he would have received (not calculated but Member remained seized)
s. 8	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Moore v. B.C. (Ministry of Education) and School District No. 44</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 580</a>  Judicial Review – <i>British Columbia (Ministry of Education) v. Moore</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCSC 264</a> : Appeal allowed, BCHRT decision quashed  Appeal – <i>British Columbia (Ministry of Education) v. Moore</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCCA 478</a> : Appeal of BCSC decision to quash dismissed  Appeal - <i>Moore v. British Columbia (Education)</i> , <a href="#">2012 SCC 61, [2012] 3 S.C.R. 360</a> : Appeal	C, a child with a severe learning disability and student in Rs' public school system, did not receive sufficiently intensive supports as early intervention in the development of his disability which would have subsequently allowed him to access other education services.	I2D: \$10,000  Expenses: for cost of an additional tutor for C while in school; for C's private school fees (enrollment was recommended by Rs); for half of C's transportation costs to private school; for costs of experts providing reports and attending the hearing  BCHRT also ordered systemic remedies regarding education funding, but these were overturned on appeal.

		allowed in part, order for reimbursement and damages against the District upheld, all other orders set aside		
<b>Physical Disability</b>				
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Williams (by Williams) v. Hertzberg</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 310</a>	C had physical and mental disabilities due to a serious accident, resulting in cognitive and mental health impairment. He retained R lawyer in a criminal proceeding. The Tribunal found that on several occasions the lawyer treated C dismissively, including speaking in a harsh tone and failing to properly communicate. C's disability was a factor in the lawyer's behaviour, which had an adverse impact on C's ability to access legal services.	I2D: \$30,000  Expenses: \$4,952.51 (cost of retaining a new lawyer)
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Bauer v. Uber Canada Inc. and others</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 62</a>	Unlike in many other cities, Uber did not provide wheelchair accessible transportation services in the Lower Mainland. It paid a regulatory "per-trip fee" to the BC government that it argued was paid instead of providing wheelchair accessible options. Consequently, as a wheelchair user, C could not use Uber's services. Tribunal found that Uber's discriminatory conduct could not be justified by its goal of saving costs or by its payment of the per-trip fee.	I2D: \$35,000  Order that Uber provide wheelchair accessible services within one year.

s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Bond and Bond v. The Owners, Strata Plan NW 2671</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 21</a>	Because of their lung diseases, Cs requested approval from their strata to install a heat pump and ventilation system in their townhouse. R denied the request on three occasions, saying R did not have the authority to approve and the installation would interfere with adjacent lots and common property. Tribunal found that excessive heat caused by the lack of air conditioning exacerbated C's lung condition, and R's refusal to allow them to install a heat pump was not justified.	I2D: \$13,000  Order that R approve the request for installation within one month of receiving a plan from Cs
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Kovacs v City of Maple Ridge (No 2)</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 158</a>	C is blind. The City reconstructed three intersections that C had used for decades. Tribunal found that part of the reconstruction design did not reasonably accommodate C's disability. At one intersection, R did not properly provide tactile features (truncated dome mats) that could give C directional information about the crossing, and the bus stop was in a mixed-use area where there was bicycle traffic but no "stop and dismount" sign installed.	I2D: \$35,000  Order that R add directional information and safety measures to the intersection within six months and notify C when the work begins and finishes.
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Pike v. Ooh La La Café and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 99</a>	C, who is legally blind, was refused service at R cafe because of her guide dog. The dog was properly trained and well-behaved at the time. Tribunal found that C was discriminated against on the ground of physical disability. The corporation operating the cafe and	I2D: \$12,000

			its owner were held jointly and severally liable for damages.	
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>MacLean v. Gerry Robert Enterprises dba Black Card Books</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 89</a>	C, who was DeafBlind, attended a free workshop organized by R. But since R refused to provide ASL interpretation, C was not able to participate. Tribunal found that R failed to take reasonable steps to provide accommodation because it never tried to find out the cost of hiring an ASL interpreter before refusing to do so.	I2D: \$2,500  Order that R provide C with the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the workshop with the interpretation services of his choice.
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Cameron v. Burrardview Housing Co-Operative (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 74</a>	C with respiratory conditions complained of mold in her unit. R's response was disproportionately delayed, and later R failed to conduct proper mold remediation as part of its duty to accommodate. Consequently, C's conditions worsened due to the continuous presence of mold.	I2D: \$20,000  Expenses: \$2,305.77 for inspection reports and medical expenses.
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Testar v. The Owners, Strata Plan VR 1097</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 70</a>	C was unable to use the outdoor stairs in his strata due to numerous medical conditions. His proposal to install a tram elevator was rejected by other strata owners without giving him a reasonable alternative. The Tribunal found the strata had not accommodated him to the point of undue hardship.	I2D: \$35,000 plus an order to make reasonable efforts to approve and build the tram within 6 months.
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Client v. Spruce Hill Resort &amp; Spa</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 104</a>	R refused to give C a massage because she had cancer. R did not participate in the hearing to defend the complaint.	I2D: \$15,000 LW: \$1,536

s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Jacobsen v. Strata Plan SP1773 (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 170</a>	C had a disability and used a wheelchair. Several areas of her building were not accessible to her. She could not leave her unit without assistance from friends. The strata did not take prompt and effective action to address her needs. It failed to obtain useful opinions and cost estimates from experts or consider a special levy. It did not show it had accommodated to the point of undue hardship. Nor did it approach the issue of accommodation with an attitude of respect.	I2D: \$35,000  Order to obtain expert opinions and architectural drawings and build the necessary accommodations within 9 months.
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Mr. X v. CDI College and others</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 11</a>	C had a hearing disability. A teacher at the College refused to use a hearing assistance system C had obtained to allow him to hear and understand his classes. Allegations of discrimination on the basis of age, sex, and mental disability were dismissed.	I2D: \$5,000
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Bowker v. Strata Plan NWS 2539</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 43</a>	C had pulmonary fibrosis (lung disease) and owed a strata unit above another unit with heavy smokers. C's health was adversely impacted by second-hand smoke entering her unit from below. R failed to reasonably accommodate C's disability to the point of undue hardship.	I2D: \$7,500 (*with \$2000 already paid by R offset against this sum)
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Belusic v. Yellow Cab of Victoria</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 81</a>	R's employee, a taxi driver, admitted that he declined to serve C, a blind person, because he did not want his guide dog in his taxi.	I2D: \$7,500  Expenses: \$1,000  Post-judgement interest

				Order that R affix a visible label to all vehicles in their fleet stating that the taxi cabs are guide dog friendly
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Rankin v. B.C. (Ministry of Justice) (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 100</a>	RoadSafety BC failed to reasonably accommodate C when it failed to offer her a learner's license for a standard transmission vehicle between April 27, 2015, and October, 2016 when the offer was made.	<p>I2D: \$10,000</p> <p>Loss of EI benefit eligibility: \$6,324</p> <p>Expenses: \$2,200 for cost of air fare, hotel, meals, and other expenses to attend the hearing</p> <p>Order that R develop a new training program or amend its existing one; see p. [297] for details of the program, and to notify C and the Tribunal of the steps it has taken in doing so</p>
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Leary v. Strata Plan VR1001</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 139</a>	C experienced an adverse impact related to her disability due to secondhand smoke in her suite. This impact was long-standing and supported by medical Evidence. R did not properly inquire into the extent and impact, how to accommodate or whether it would amount to undue hardship.	I2D: \$7,500
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>M obo C v. PS and A</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 217</a>	Diabetic 3-year old child with peanut butter in his emergency kit denied enrollment at pre-school due to school's peanut-free policy.	I2D: \$2,500

<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>McCreath v. Victoria International Running Society and another</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 53</a>	Blind runner discriminated against when not allowed a head start with other disabled racers in 10K race.	I2D: \$2,500 LW: \$500  Order that R undergo training re accommodation
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Wollenberg v. North West Athletics</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 178</a>	Gym denied member the ability to do one exercise using boots needed for tendon support due to his physical disability.	I2D: \$1,000  Expenses: \$400 for C's reduced utilization of Rs facilities; \$500 for lost wages incurred in pursuing the complaint; \$16 for parking expenses to attend the hearing
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>McDaniel and McDaniel v. Strata Plan LMS 1657 (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 167</a>	Strata R failed to deal with smoke entering Cs' suite, was patronizing, did little to address Cs concerns for 3 years. R characterized Cs medical evidence as "scant" but did not seek more information about Cs physical vulnerabilities for almost three years.	I2D: Mr. McDaniel \$2,000; Ms. McDaniel \$4,500  Expenses: \$1,118.88 for itemized expenses; \$400 for travel and accommodation expenses to attend the hearing
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Garrow v. Strata Plan LMS-1306 (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 4</a>	C, who had limited mobility, was unable to access or leave his unit during scheduled elevator shutdowns and forced to stay at hotels during these times. Rs could have reasonably accommodated C in paying for these hotel costs.	No LW as C did not testify as to the personal impact of Rs' behaviour and contributed by his own actions to the parties inability to arrive at a suitable accommodation.  Expenses: \$222.96 for past hotel stays
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Laberge v. Martier School of Hair Design &amp; Esthetics</i>	R discriminated against C because of her physical disability when they required her to leave classes early;	I2D: \$10,000

		<i>and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 302</a>	when they required her to move from the day to the evening class, then to move from the evening class to one-on-one instruction, and when they did not provide her with the full course instruction hour. R's alleged that C, who had bladder issues, had an odour and this was the reason for her removal.	Student loan reimbursement \$3,500  Future LW: \$3,000
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Hall v. B. C. (Ministry of Environment) (No. 6)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 189</a> (remedy)  See also <i>Hall v. B.C. (Ministry of Environment) (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 389</a> (merits)	Tribunal found that the Ministry of Environment discriminated against C and other disabled hunters by restricting their hunting permits so that they could have only one non-hunting companion when they went hunting.	I2D: \$5,000  Expenses: \$500 for photocopying and other costs to pursue complaint
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Shannon v. The Owners, Strata Plan KAS 1613 (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 438</a>	Strata discriminated against C in not allowing him to retain the solar screen to reduce the use of in-home air conditioning, which exacerbated his Physical disability. R failed to justify its conduct/establish undue hardship.  The Tribunal awarded costs for failure of R to accept reasonable offer.	I2D: \$2,500  Costs: to be agreed upon by the parties
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>James and Moynan v. City of Salmon Arm</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 285</a>	City enforced nuisance bylaw against disabled C growing medical marijuana. C was in the process of renewing license but delay incurred due to gov't processing so did not have "license" at the time.	No I2D as C did not seek an award  Order that R rescind the Do Not Occupy notice, reconnect the water supply, cancel all costs sought by it in relation to enforcement

				of the Bylaw, related to this case
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Mahoney obo Holowaychuk v. The Owners, Strata Plan #NW332 and others</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 274</a>	Rs failed to provide wheelchair access in a strata building between main lobby and elevators.	<p>No I2D as C did not seek an award.</p> <p>Order that Rs obtain architectural drawings and quotes and to seek approval for those drawings from City authorities.</p> <p>Order that R install wheelchair ramp if quotes received in a bid tender process are in line with estimated cost presented at hearing.</p> <p>If the architectural drawings are not approved by the City or if the bids for the ramp installation exceed the estimated cost, the parties are ordered to attend Tribunal assisted mediation to resolve the issues in the complaint.</p>
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Johnson v. AC Taxi and Williams (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 242</a>	C suffered from chronic pain. Cab driver drove erratically hurting C and would not stop when asked, but told C he was “a weirdo.”	I2D: \$2,500
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Edwards v. Foglia and Champion Cabs</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 517</a>	C was denied access to cab company because company was afraid of liability loading C into and out of Cab.	I2D: \$2,500  (but see Judicial Review note)

		Judicial Review – <i>Foglia v. Edwards</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCSC 861</a> ; BCHRT award for I2D set aside		
s. 8	Physical Disability	<i>Thiessen v. L A Weight Loss</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 313</a>	C denied enrolment at Health Club/Weight loss centre due to Hepatitis C, as R’s diet included foods that R believed C could not eat because of her disability. R changed policy to include doctor confirmation, but took several months to do so.	I2D: \$1,000
s. 8	Physical Disability	<i>Leong v. Knight &amp; Day Restaurants and another</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 84</a>	Diabetic C injected herself with insulin at a restaurant. Waitress employee of R described C’s doing so as “disgusting”. Manager employee of R essentially agreed with waitress and would not assure food would be delivered in a timely manner to avoid risks of diabetic reaction. C later contacted Corporate R and was refused an apology, told to “go ahead” and file a human rights complaint.	I2D: \$2,500
s. 8	Physical Disability	<i>Moser v. District of Sechelt</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 72</a>	Wheelchair user C unable to use seawall pathway.	I2D: \$1,000  Order that R ameliorate the effects of the discrimination (installation of an external railing considered but not specifically ordered to allow for possible alternative solutions)

s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<p><i>Bolster v. B.C. (Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General)</i>, <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 32</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>HMTQ v. Bolster &amp; BC Human Rights Tribunal</i>, <a href="#">2005 BCSC 1491</a>: BCHRT decision upheld</p> <p>Appeal – <i>British Columbia v. Bolster</i>, <a href="#">2007 BCCA 65</a>: appeal of BCSC decision dismissed</p>	C was denied a driver's license due to visual disability. Individual assessment initially refused, but later provided after several years. C was unable to work due to inability to drive.	<p>I2D: \$5,000</p> <p>LW: \$141,939.38</p> <p>Expenses: unspecified quantum for cost of C's individual assessment</p>
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Hussey v. B.C. (Min. of Public Safety and Solicitor General)</i> <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 76</a>	C had to pay for assessment of his hearing ability to obtain a class 4 driver's license.	<p>I2D: \$500</p> <p>Order that R cover the extra cost for persons with hearing loss disabilities if R requires a specialized individualized assessment</p>
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Konieczna v. The Owners Strata Plan NW2489</i> <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 38</a>	R had bylaw prohibiting any flooring other than carpeting, failing to accommodate C's allergies to components of carpeting/dust, etc. C is elderly and experienced physical discomfort, Rs showed indifference to C's concerns and acted aggressively and inflexibly.	<p>I2D: \$3,500 (C asked for \$5,000)</p> <p>Order that R ensure C would not be the subject of any special levy or charges for R's payment of the monetary award or any legal costs incurred.</p>
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Williams v. Strata Council #768</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 17</a>	C, a strata lot owner in a building owned and operated by R, had mobility and health issues. R disabled its automatic door-opening	I2D: \$1,500

			system from 8PM to 8AM. In the event of a health emergency, C would be unable to go to the lobby to let in emergency services as necessitated by the disabling of the door system.	Expenses: \$625.50 for half of expenses C incurred in pursuing arbitration  Order that C not be subject to any special levy for payment of the mandatory award  Order that R remove the lock timer that disabled the automatic door opening system and return the intercom and entry system to its previous state.
s. 8	<b>Physical Disability; Mental Disability</b>	<i>Robb v. St. Margaret's School</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 4</a>	C, a child with a severe learning disability, attended R, a school. She was refused re-enrollment for Grade 5 because of her mental disability. Rs retaliated against C by refusing to meet with parents after complaint was filed. Rs also wrote an letter to parents about C and C's family during complaint process.	I2D: \$5,000 for discrimination  I2D: \$1,000 for retaliation
<b>Place of Origin</b>				
s. 8	<b>Place of Origin; Sex; Sexual Orientation; Mental Disability</b>	<i>Fernandes v. City University of Seattle in Canada and another</i> (No. 2), <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 116</a>	C was enrolled as a student with R. R perceived C to be "mentally unstable" and therefore a threat for sexual violence. C told by R that he could 1) withdraw from the program, access mental health care, and return when approved by a professional; or 2) withdraw permanently and receive a refund. R	I2D: \$17,500 Expenses: \$5,221.44 (for tuition, books, application fee)

			then deregistered C from the program entirely. Tribunal found that C's perceived mental disability was a factor in the decision to remove him from the program.	
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Place of Origin</b>	<i>C1 and Sangha v. Sheraton Wall Centre (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 147</a>	R discriminated by denying room bookings for participants in a Bhangra dance and music event they were organizing in at the R's hotel.	I2D: \$2,500 to each of two Cs
<b>Race</b>				
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Race</b>	<i>Blokhuis v. Mission Possible (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 98</a>	R organization ran a non-profit pottery studio. A participant at the studio made a racist comment about biracial people. C, who was biracial, was also a participant at the studio and heard about the comment (which was not made in C's presence). C then complained to R about the comment. The Tribunal found that R's response to the complaint was discriminatory in that it failed to recognize the racist nature of the comment, developed a negative perception of C, failed to make further inquiry of the complaint, and effectively made C leave the studio.	I2D: \$5,000  R to develop an anti-discriminatory policy and a complaint mechanism, and provide training
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Race; Ancestry; Colour; and Mental Disability</b>	<i>RR v. Vancouver Aboriginal Child and Family Services Society (No. 6)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 116</a>  <i>Vancouver Aboriginal Child and Family Services</i>	C is an Afro-Indigenous woman with disabilities related to trauma, including substance use. R is an Indigenous-led agency responsible for enforcing Canada's child protection laws. R removed C's four children from her care and strictly	I2D: \$150,000 (overturned on judicial review, <a href="#">2024 BCSC 97</a> ; but reinstated on further appeal, <a href="#">2025 BCCA 151</a> )

		<p><i>Society v. R.R.</i>, <a href="#">2024 BCSC 97</a> On judicial review, the BC Supreme Court overturned the Tribunal's decision and sent it back for reconsideration.</p>	<p>regulated her access to them for nearly three years. The Tribunal found that R's decisions to retain custody and restrict C's access to her children were informed by stereotypes about her as an Indigenous mother with past mental health issues. It also found that R did not have reasonable grounds to continue keeping the children in its custody and that none of the discriminatory conduct could be justified as reasonably necessary to protect RR's children.</p>	
s. 8	Race	<p><i>Ben Maaouia and others v. Toscani Coffee Bar and another</i>, <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 23</a></p>	<p>4 Cs filed a complaint against a coffee shop and one of its owners. One C alleged that the individual R told him "I don't want you Arabs here, and you should tell your friends." Tribunal found that R, a woman of colour, had said this more out of distress because she felt disrespected by C and his friends rather than a desire to harm them. Nevertheless, such intent not necessary. This was a very important place to all 4 Cs; they had each gone there daily as a place to gather and connect with other North African immigrants.</p>	<p>I2D: \$1,000 for each Complainant (Cs asked for \$2,500 each).</p>
s. 8	Race; Colour; Ancestry	<p><i>Campbell v. Vancouver Police Board (No. 4)</i>, <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 275</a></p>	<p>C, an Indigenous woman, witnessed her son and a friend being arrested. When C attempted to get information regarding her son, the police physically removed her and threatened her with charges of</p>	<p>I2D: \$20,000 Expenses: \$1,500  Order that VPD implement anti-discrimination training that acknowledges</p>

			obstructing justice. The Tribunal found that VPD were dismissive and treated C adversely on the basis of her Indigenous identity. The VPD's actions perpetuated historical disadvantage of Indigenous people. The VPD must acknowledge social context when policing.	particular needs of indigenous people and specific to discrimination Indigenous people face in a policing context
<b>s. 8 (also s. 14)</b>	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Brar and others v. B.C. Veterinary Medical Association and Osborne (No. 22)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 151</a>	Racial stereotypes played a role in R's dealings with Cs including an English language standard that was higher than necessary and selection of Cs' facilities for unscheduled inspections.  C also filed a s.7 complaint which was dismissed by the Tribunal.	I2D: \$35,000, \$15,000, \$10,000, \$7,500, \$30,000, \$10,000, \$10,000, \$2,000, \$5,000, \$25,000, \$10,000, \$30,000 for various Cs  LW: \$1,138.46 for to attend the hearing calculated for four days of testimony and \$39,505 for lost wages due to delay in licensing C, both awarded to Dr. Joshi only
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry</b>	<i>Rai and others v. Shark Club of Langley (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 204</a>	South Asian Cs were denied entry to the Shark Club and assaulted. White patrons were allowed in without tickets while Cs were refused entry for not having tickets.	I2D: \$10,000 to each C
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry</b>	<i>Holland and Jack v. Prince George Taxi and Kuuluvainen</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 317</a>	Cab driver required First Nations passengers to pay in advance called them "you people", "you Indians", and "you fucking Indians".	I2D: \$2,000 to each C
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Race; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Radek v. Henderson Development (Canada) and Securiguard Services (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 302</a>	C and a friend were prevented from entering shopping mall by security staff employed by R. C is Aboriginal and suffers from a visible physical disability.	I2D: \$15,000  Expenses: to attend the hearing and produce an expert report to be agreed upon between counsel

				<p>Order that R require all security personnel at the International Village receive appropriate anti-discrimination training, are aware of public right of way through the mall</p> <p>Order that R ensure there is an appropriate procedure for receiving and responding to public complaints about security personnel</p> <p>Order that R provide any person requesting a copy of the decision or any site post orders or other directions receives such documents</p>
s. 8	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Chauhan v. Norkam Seniors Housing Cooperative Assn.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 262</a>	<p>C was told by R to stop preparing ethnic food in her rented property.</p> <p>The retaliation occurred after Ms. Chauhan filed her complaint in the form of threat to terminate her sub-lease.</p>	<p>I2D: \$2,500 (for both complaint and retaliation)</p> <p>Expenses: \$1,925 for legal fees; \$572.45 for fees paid to an engineering firm; \$73.97 for photocopying, courier, postage, and other costs</p>
s. 8	<b>Race; Ancestry</b>	<i>Harry v. Trail Apothecary Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 238</a>	Pharmacy R's policy of not processing claims directly through insurers when valued at less than \$300 adversely affected First Nations C, who was unable to have	<p>I2D: \$1,500</p> <p>Order that R correct policy</p>

			<p>medical equipment paid through NHIB insurance designated for First Nations individuals.</p> <p>Adverse effect discrimination in the way a drug store policy affected proof of eligibility for medical coverage.</p>	Expenses: \$344.76 for air fare to attend the hearing
s. 8	<b>Race; Colour</b>	<p><i>Ibrahim v. Immigrant Services Society of British Columbia</i>, <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 1</a></p>	<p>New immigrant C was subject to racist remarks by R's employees. R's conduct was not of the most egregious kind but upset C, who was a refugee in an institution designed to be a safe haven for refugees and therefore a highly vulnerable person vulnerable to discrimination from staff.</p>	I2D: \$2,000
s. 8	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<p><i>Bitonti et al. v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of B.C.</i>, <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 29</a></p> <p>See also <i>Bitonti et al. v. College of Physicians and Surgeons of British Columbia</i> (No. 3) (1999), 36 C.H.R.R. D/263.</p>	<p>Cs, graduates of foreign medical schools, had to meet more stringent standards. Cs engaged in lengthy dispute including two hunger strikes.</p>	<p>I2D: Multiple Cs received \$7,500 except one, who received \$2,000 (less because C left BC to find work elsewhere for unrelated reasons)</p> <p>LW: \$60,372 for one C, \$51,719 for the other for income lost as a result of the contravention</p>
<b>Religion</b>				
s. 8	<b>Religion</b>	<p><i>Shahadat v. Northern School of Spa Therapies</i> (No. 3), <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 120</a></p>	<p>A massage school denied services to C, a Muslim man of mixed Arab and Indian descent. The director of the school invoked discriminatory and harmful stereotypes about Muslim people, including that they</p>	<p>I2D \$10,000</p> <p>Costs: \$2,500</p>

			are dangerous and subscribe to religious beliefs that are anti-woman and a threat to Western society. She denied him services explicitly because he is Muslim. Her conduct was ongoing throughout the complaint process, resulting in an award of costs against her.	
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<i>Kelly v. B.C. (Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General) (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 183</a>	First Nations inmate denied access to aboriginal religious counselling and materials while in prison.	I2D: \$5,000
<b>Sex (Gender)</b>				
s. 8	<b>Sex; Mental Disability</b>	<i>Hale v. University of British Columbia Okanagan (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 121</a>	C, a woman, was sexually assaulted by a male university student. It triggered her PTSD. The school applied its Non-Academic Misconduct (“NAM”) policy to investigate and determine whether the male student committed non-academic misconduct. The process did not address C’s needs and exacerbated the harms. Tribunal found that R failed to fulfill its duty to reasonably respond to C’s allegations and to restore a discrimination-free learning environment for C, creating adverse impacts related to C’s sex and mental health.	I2D: \$50,000 LW: \$6,648.98 Expenses: \$8,276.25
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<i>Dawson v. Vancouver Police Board (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 54</a>	C is a transgender woman. She was discriminated against by R when she was in custody and her concerns about	I2D: \$15,000  Order that within one year, policies are to be adopted by R that allow

			her post-operative procedure were not seriously considered. R also discriminated by referring to her by her “male” dead name and male pronouns. She advised the officers she was a transgender woman, but was not treated as such.	identification of trans people without discrimination. Officers to be trained in implementation of these policies.
s. 8	<b>Sex; Sexual Orientation</b>	<i>Pardy v. Earle and others (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 101</a>  Judicial Review - <i>Ismail v. British Columbia (Human Rights Tribunal)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCSC 1079</a> : Petition dismissed	Comedian R at comedy club discriminated against lesbian C by making multiple derogatory comments towards C and her girlfriend. R also grabbed C’s sunglasses and broke them. R intended to attack C’s identity and dignity in the most extreme terms that came to mind.	I2D: \$15,000 against comedian R, \$7,500 against venue Rs  LW: \$320 for attending hearing
s. 8	<b>Sex</b>	<i>Hawkins obo Beacon Hill Little League Major Girls Softball Team – 2005 v. Little League Canada (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 12</a>	An all-male team, winners of a baseball Divisional Championship were provided a “Travel Package” by League R, including air plane tickets, to attend the National Championship. The all-female C softball team also won their divisional championship and were to attend a National championship, but were not given a “Travel Package”.	I2D: \$1,000 to each team member
s. 8	<b>Sex; Sexual Orientation</b>	<i>Waters v. BC Medical Services Plan</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 13</a>	C, a transgender man, had a phalloplasty procedure out of province that R would only partially compensate for (amount that would be covered if it was done in BC). C’s physical integrity was denied; R’s refusal to provide him with similarly funded medical services marginalized and ignored his needs	I2D: \$6,500  Expenses: \$33,071.67 for medical costs of procedures C had done in the US, plus payment for completion of phalloplasty (some procedures still had to be done); \$1,000 for

			and harmed his dignity. R would compensate other types of surgery at the “usual and customary” rate.	legal costs prior to filing complaint.
<b>s. 8 (also s. 13)</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<p><i>Nixon v. Vancouver Rape Relief Society</i>, <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 1</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>Vancouver Rape Relief Society v. Nixon et al.</i>, <a href="#">2003 BCSC 1936</a>: BCHRT decision set aside</p> <p>Appeal – <i>Vancouver Rape Relief Society v. Nixon</i>, <a href="#">2005 BCCA 601</a>: Appeal of BCSC decision dismissed</p>	C was forbidden from volunteering with R because she was a transgendered woman, but had been born male and so had enjoyed male privilege. C was hurt and humiliated, had a major anxiety attack, and contemplated suicide.	I2D: \$7,500 (largest award to this point had been \$6,500)  (but see Judicial Review and Appeal note)
<b>s. 8</b>	<b>Sex; Sexual Orientation</b>	<p><i>Gill and Maher, Murray and Popoff v. Ministry of Health</i>, <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 34</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>The Minister of Health Planning et al v. The British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal et al</i>, <a href="#">2003 BCSC 1112</a>: BCHRT decision overturned in part – order that petitioner amend birth registration form to allow another option set aside</p>	Birth registration for a child born via donor insemination required name of mother and father. Birth mother’s female partner could not be entered in the “father information” part of the registration form, instead that partner had to adopt the child.	I2D: \$500 for each C (Cs asked for \$10,000 each)  Order that the Respondent amend the Birth Registration form so that it provides the option of identifying, as a parent, a non-biological parent who is the co-parent of a mother or father  (but see Judicial Review note)
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>				

s. 8	Sexual Orientation	<i>Eadie and Thomas v. Riverbend Bed and Breakfast and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 247</a>	Gay couple denied reservation at B&B due to owner's religious beliefs.	I2D: \$1,500 to each C Expenses: \$403 and \$447 for wages lost to attend the hearing
s. 8	Sexual Orientation	<i>Smith and Chymyshyn v. Knights of Columbus and others</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 544</a>	Cs rented a hall owned by Rs for a same-sex marriage and were denied access when R learned that this was the purpose of the rental.	I2D: \$1,000 (Cs recognized R was a non-profit and only asked for this amount)  Expenses: \$444.59 (costs of reprinting invitations and renting an alternate hall)
s. 8	Sexual Orientation	<i>Rainbow Committee of Terrace v. City of Terrace</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 26</a>	R refused to declare "Gay Pride Day". The social and moral acceptability of the sexual orientation of the individuals represented by C was a central part of the discussion in not declaring "Gay Pride Day", with one councillor stating that the "agenda" was morally and socially unacceptable.	No I2D as C did not seek an award, but Tribunal would have made an award "in the higher range" of awards given by the Tribunal.  Order that Rs must proclaim "Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender Pride Day" in their city, to be advertised in the local newspaper and on the local TV station once a day for a week to be paid by R.
s. 8	Sexual Orientation	<i>Jubran v. Board of Trustees</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 10</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Board of School Trustees of School District No. 44 (North Vancouver) v.</i>	C was repeatedly called homophobic slurs by classmates.	I2D: \$4,000 total (varying amounts for different school years)  (but see Judicial Review and Appeal note)

		<p><a href="#">Jubran, 2003 BCSC 6</a>: BCHRT decision overturned</p> <p>Appeal – <i>School District No. 44 (North Vancouver) v. Jubran</i>, <a href="#">2005 BCCA 201</a>: BCSC decision overturned and new trial ordered</p>		
<b>s. 9 – Purchase of Property</b>				
<b>Marital Status</b>				
<b>s. 9</b>	<b>Marital Status</b>	<p><i>Sparvier v. Brighton Beach Properties Ltd.</i>, <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 281</a></p>	<p>C was involved in the transfer of a landholding share that required approval by the shareholders of R corporation. It was known that many shareholders disliked C's partner, a former shareholder. After assessing C's circumstances, the shareholders refused to transfer the share to her. The tribunal found that C was in a marriage-like relationship with her partner, and her marital status was a factor in the failed property transaction due to the shareholders' mistrust of C's partner.</p>	I2D: \$25,000
<b>Physical Disability</b>				
<b>s. 9</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<p><i>Jones v. The Owners Strata Plan 1571 and others</i>, <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 200</a></p>	<p>C was legally blind and was denied purchase of property because his dog, who he relied upon for safety, was not a certified guide dog.</p>	I2D: \$12,000

<b>Sexual Orientation; Physical Disability</b>				
<b>s. 9</b>	<b>Sexual Orientation; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Outingdyke v. Irving Apartments and others</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 443</a>	Denied the right to purchase property in a Co-Op due to HIV positive status.  Loss of opportunity (property value) allowed to continue as a separate action in BCSC.	I2D: \$6,500
<b>s. 10 – Tenancy Premises</b>				
<b>Age</b>				
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Age</b>	<i>Martin v. The Grove Mobile Home Park</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 45</a>	R evicted C from mobile home park because enforced an age restriction requiring tenants be 55 or older.	I2D: \$2,500
<b>Family Status</b>				
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Zarei and another v Austeville Properties Ltd</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 70</a>	C1 was a tenant in a one-bedroom apartment owned by R. C1's sister, C2, moved to Canada to study and wanted to live with C1 while transitioning to life here. C1 requested co-occupancy under the lease. R refused and explained that the unit was only for single occupancy or a matrimonial or common law couple. Tribunal found that Cs' family status as siblings was a factor in R's decision to deny co-occupancy. Tribunal accepted that R had a genuine concern under its makeshift bedroom policy, which prohibited makeshift bedrooms in its units. But R did not take any step to consider how co-occupancy might	I2D: \$7,500 each for the two Cs  Expenses: \$16,465.37 (including mostly C2's rent for a separate apartment)

			have been possible in compliance with the policy.	
s. 10	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Horneland v. Wong and another</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 3</a>	C denied rental accommodation because she had a young child.	I2D: \$2,500
s. 10	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Nicolosi v. Victoria Gardens Housing Co-operative and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 1</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Victoria Gardens Housing Cooperative v. Nicolosi</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCSC 1989</a> : BCHRT decision upheld	C removed from Co-op list due to her relationship with her daughter, and thus because of C’s family status as mother.	I2D: \$7,500  Order that C be placed at the top of the VGHC waiting list and offered the next two-bedroom unit that becomes available. R’s board will consider C’s application on the basis that the Membership Committee has recommended her and that all references have been successfully checked
s. 10	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Cha and Cha v. Hollyburn Estates (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 409</a>	Rs policy not to rent single bedroom apartments to families was applied to Cs. Cs suffered some injury to dignity, feelings, and self-respect, but exaggerated their evidence somewhat.	I2D: \$500 (Cs asked for \$1,000)
s. 10	<b>Family Status; Marital Status; Race</b>	<i>Raweater v. MacDonald</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 63</a>	C was discriminated against by landlord R, who made negative comments about her son being “less disturbed” if his father was “in the picture”. R also said he would evict C if she caused “trouble in the neighbourhood”, and asked if C was going to “go to Indian Affairs” regarding a dispute; suggesting that she would be evicted if she did. The rental became untenable due to R’s	I2D: \$1,500  LW: \$274 to attend the hearing

			harassing and discriminatory attitude.	
<b>Gender Identity or Expression</b>				
s. 10	<b>Gender Identity or Expression</b>	<i>Wiebe v. Olsen</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 14</a>	C lived in a motorhome on R's rural property and paid rent. C later informed R of their decision to have gender-affirming surgery. R, a close friend at the time, expressed discomfort and discouragement. On several occasions, R did not confirm whether C could still stay, but expressed being uncomfortable with C staying if C had the surgery. The Tribunal found that the parties' relationship constituted a tenancy. R made transphobic comments in the context of friendship, not tenancy. But her expression of being no longer comfortable with C's stay caused an adverse impact on the tenancy relationship, which constituted discrimination. The Tribunal also found that R later evicted C for non-discriminatory reasons.	I2D: \$10,000
<b>Mental Disability</b>				
s. 10	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>McMillan and another (by McMillan and another) v. British Columbia Housing Management Commission (BC Housing) and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 242</a>	C had disabilities. Non-profit R was building a new rental building where 25% of units were supposed to be reserved for people with disabilities. C applied for a rental unit in the building and attended the building for an interview. After the interview, she was denied a unit in the building	I2D: \$18,000  (post-judgment interest)  The R was ordered to immediately provide an opportunity for the C to participate in a

			<p>on the basis that the R concluded she could not live independently.</p> <p>The Tribunal found that the interview was not an appropriate way of assessing C's ability to live independently. Further, the Tribunal found that the R did not accommodate C's disabilities in the interview process. The R knew that C had disabilities and did not consider or inquire into C's disability-related needs in the interview process. There was no reasonable basis upon which to conclude that C could not live independently. The R's conduct was not justified.</p>	discrimination-free tenant selection process.
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Flak v. Andersen</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 87</a>	Landlord revoked offer of rental after C declared she suffered from depression.	I2D: \$2,000
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Mental Disability; Family Status</b>	<i>Petterson and Poirier v. Gorcak (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 439</a>	Neighbours suspected C might key a car, start a fire or harm their pets. R heard that C (son) had threatened to kill a cat, uttered death threats and other serious accusations. C and his mother (also a C) were evicted. C was perceived to have a mental disability, mother filed under family status.	<p>I2D: Mr. Poirier \$9,000; Ms. Petterson \$6,000</p> <p>Expenses: \$2,973 to Mr. Poirier and \$1,360 to Ms. Petterson equal to 12 months of the differential between Cs' previous housing costs and new, higher housing costs as well as moving costs</p> <p>Expenses: unspecified quantum for legal costs to be determined subject to</p>

				further submissions to the Tribunal from the parties
s. 10	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Tanner and Vlake</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 36</a>	R refused to consider C as a renter because of his source of income, a disability pension.	I2D: \$1,500 (C asked for \$2,000)
<b>Physical Disability</b>				
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Lloyd v. Fernanda Almeida and others (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 12</a>	<p>C was a tenant in the basement suite of Rs' home. C had osteoarthritis which was exacerbated by stress and affected her mobility. Rs restricted C's use of parking, storage, laundry and outdoor space. These restrictions adversely impacted C in connection with her disability. Rs conduct was not justified.</p> <p>Rs retaliated against C after she filed her complaint when they terminated her laundry access, turned off the heat in her suite, attempted to evict her on multiple occasions, refused to address mold in her suite, and engaged in surveillance, harassment and intimidation of C and her guests.</p> <p>Rs initiated a relentless, escalating campaign targeting C for adverse treatment because of her disabilities, and retaliated against her for asserting her rights.</p>	<p>I2D: \$60,000 (discrimination and retaliation combined)</p> <p>Expenses: \$30,596.17 (post-judgment interest)</p> <p>Costs: \$10,000</p>
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Han v. New Chelsea Society and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 95</a>	C's asthma was exacerbated by the presence of mould in her apartment. R did not provide necessary	I2D: \$15,000

			remediation in a timely manner. C had to seek short-term accommodations elsewhere as a result.	Expenses: \$20,170.98 for accommodation, \$525 for expert report on mould, \$1,446.82 for living expenses, and \$19 for purchases
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>AB v. Rankin and another</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 73</a>	C has bowel-related and lung conditions which require him to wash his underwear and masks with hot water to properly sanitize them. R, his landlords, refused to provide him with a washing machine capable of heating water or removing the old machine when C bought his own.	I2D: \$12,000  Expenses: \$2,536.84 (cost of new machine)
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>NT by HST v. Daljit Sekhon and others</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 201</a>	R acquired the property that C (dependent child) and representative were renting and removed existing accommodations C required. R's failure to accommodate escalated to encourage Cs to leave. C especially vulnerable as property was close to disability-friendly school and could not avoid adverse impact. Cs evicted for family use but Tribunal found that escalating discrimination was part of reason for eviction.	I2D: \$10,000
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Biggings obo Walsh v. Pink and others</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 174</a>	C with ALS rented a unit in a building owned by Rs. C had significantly limited mobility and required wheelchair. C requested Rs build ramp to allow wheelchair access, which was refused following a viability investigation by Rs. C left	I2D: \$35,000  Expenses: \$5,406  Order that Rs go to all reasonable steps to obtain

			effectively housebound. Tribunal found discrimination, stating that Rs did not accommodate C and did not take all reasonable and practical steps to remove the disability-related barrier.	necessary permits and build ramp.
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Redmond v. Hunter Hill Housing Co-op (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 276</a>	R discriminated against Cs on the basis of physical disabilities by failing to remediate their housing unit to the point that it could be occupied without triggering C's allergies. R did not make enough effort to find out what could be done and therefore could not be said to have determined there would be undue hardship. C was significantly affected by allergy symptoms while living in her unit and was ultimately forced to move out with her family, causing a significant emotional impact.	I2D: \$10,000  Expenses: \$1,500 for expenses incurred and for work performed to improve the property for which she could have no further benefit
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Stewart v. Satorotas Enterprises and others</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 442</a>	C is 68 years of age. She has severe osteoporosis and a clubfoot. C resided on the main floor of an apartment. The entrance to the apartment building is by way of five concrete steps. C required a walker for mobility. C requested that the Respondents build a ramp to allow her to safely access her apartment. The Respondents refused.	I2D: \$15,000  Order that R build ramp, to come into effect three months from the date of the decision.
s. 10	<b>Physical Disability; Source of Income</b>	<i>James obo James v. Silver Park Campsites and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 141</a> ; see also	Rs discriminated against C based on his disability and source of income when they rejected four	I2D: \$10,000

		<p><i>James obo James v. Silver Park Campsites and another</i>, <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 370</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>Silver Campsites Ltd. v. James</i>, <a href="#">2012 BCSC 1437</a>: BCHRT decision overturned in part</p> <p>Appeal – <i>British Columbia v. Bolster</i>, <a href="#">2007 BCCA 65</a>: appeal of BCSC decision allowed, BCHRT decision confirmed</p>	applications to rent a manufactured home pad.	
s. 10	Physical Disability; Sexual Orientation; Source of Income	<p><i>Bro and Scott v. Moody (No. 2)</i>, <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 8</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>Moody v. Scott</i>, <a href="#">2012 BCSC 657</a>: BCHRT decision upheld</p>	Cs physically assaulted by landlord R with a metal pipe and were called “fags” and “fairies” among other derogatory terms. Cs were subject to a pattern of discrimination culminating in a physical incident requiring police intervention.	I2D: \$15,000 to each C
s. 10	Physical Disability	<p><i>Ferguson v. Kimpton</i>, <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 62</a></p>	C, a person with mobility limitations, was adversely affected when her landlord delayed in installing a handrail for four days she needed to use a set of stairs in the building.	I2D: \$500
s. 10	Physical Disability	<p><i>McDonald v. Schuster Real Estate</i>, <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 177</a></p>	HIV positive C told R that he received disability payments from the government, R’s response was that he hoped thee disability was not AIDS because he was not running a hostel. R was rude on multiple	I2D: \$2,500

			occasions and was offensive in his response to the complaint in calling C unkempt. C vulnerable because of his disability to derogatory comments and conduct.	
<b>Race; Ancestry, Place of Origin, Religion</b>				
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Race; Ancestry, Place of Origin, Religion</b>	<i>Smith v. Mohan (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 52</a>	C was an Indigenous woman and mother. Her landlord discriminated against her by making a number of derogatory and stereotypical comments, and in evicting her for smudging in her apartment.	I2D: \$20,000 LW (for time off work due to stress and moving): \$1500 Expert report: \$1800
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Race; Colour; Sex; Age</b>	<i>Monsson v. Nacel Properties</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 543</a>	C, father of severely disabled son who identifies as Black, had requests for service/accommodation for son's disability ignored by Strata while white tenants received service. C was also evicted. C was treated aggressively and unprofessionally while white tenants described R as courteous and friendly. Impact of discrimination magnified as a result of upset to lives of himself and son having to relocate due to eviction.	I2D: \$7,500 Expenses: \$1,500 for 6 months of rent differential
<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>				
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>MacGarvie v. Friedmann (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 47</a>	Landlord R sexually harassed C by giving her unwanted gifts, making suggestive comments about boyfriends, touching C's buttocks,	I2D: \$10,000 (Tribunal stated range was \$1,200 to \$15,000)

			and entering C's apartment without permission.	<p>Expenses: \$1,922.84 for cost of additional cell phone minutes, change of address, portion of camcorder and videotape, moving, photocopying costs, BC Assessment fee, wrongful deduction from damage deposit, loss of wages to attend hearing, courier fees, costs for witnesses to attend hearing, preparation of documents and tape for hearing, various registry and tax searches</p> <p>Costs: \$7,500 for threatening hearing participants, making unfounded allegations against all parties including the Tribunal, delaying the hearing by failing to follow Tribunal orders. R owned several properties and had means to pay a substantial award</p>
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Dietrich v. Dhaliwal</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 6</a>	R grabbed and attempted to kiss and grope tenant C.	I2D: \$1,500
<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>				
<b>s. 10</b>	<b>Sex (Pregnancy); Family Status</b>	<i>Valdez v. Bahcheli and another</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 41</a>	C and her husband rented a one-bedroom apartment from R. When C told R she had given birth, R accused C of being a liar and told	<p>I2D: \$9,000</p> <p>Expenses: \$1923.56 (corporate search; moving</p>

			her the family would have to move. R then harassed C and evicted the family from their home.	expenses; overlapping month of rent for second apartment; rent differential for 6 months)
s. 10	<b>Sex (Pregnancy); Family Status</b>	<i>Segin v. Chung</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 42</a>	R refused to lease suite to C in part because of pregnancy and family status. The suite was in an “adult only” building and R had concern about liability for C’s child falling down the stairs.  C was pregnant at the time and struggled to find suitable accommodation but impact of discrimination was not as substantial as she claimed.	I2D: \$850 (C asked for \$2,500)
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>				
s. 10 and s. 13	<b>Sexual orientation; Marital status</b>	<i>Brooks v. Skyacres Turkey Ranch Ltd. and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 73</a>	C worked and lived on a family farm owned by his father. The father and the farm were found jointly liable for the father’s discriminatory comments and conduct in the course of C’s employment and tenancy, in relation to C’s homosexuality and later his marriage as C lived with his husband on the farm.	I2D: \$40,000
<b>Source of Income</b>				
s. 10	<b>Source of Income</b>	<i>Desjarlais v. Kanganilage and another</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 243</a>	C alleged that the Rs evicted him from his rented suite or refused to continue to accommodate him, once they discovered his disability and his source of income (IA).	I2D: \$1,100

s. 10	<b>Source of Income</b>	<i>Day v. Kumar and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 49</a>	R reneged on tenancy agreement after discovering part of C's income came from social assistance.	I2D: \$2,500  Expenses: \$300 for moving costs  Order that R advise C in writing whether the suite is vacant as of the date of the decision and offer it to him if it is vacant, or to offer him the suite when Rs next know it will be vacant at any time during the two years following the date of the decision, on the same terms as the most recent tenants.
s. 10	<b>Source of Income</b>	<i>Coreas and Coreas v. Tuyen (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 218</a>	R directed insulting and demeaning comments toward C and denied access to laundry facilities. R's behaviour was influenced by the mistaken belief that C was receiving welfare.	I2D: \$1,000 to Veronica Coreas; \$1,500 to Olivia Coreas
s. 10	<b>Source of Income; Family Status</b>	<i>Neale v. Princeton Place Apts. Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 6</a>	C responded to a rental ad for her and her daughter. She was told that R does not usually accept tenants who are not working and who are on assistance. C also felt she was being accused of having an illegal source of income. She was dissuaded from applying by R representative. The Tribunal found discrimination based on source of income as R stated they do not accept people who are "on assistance".	I2D: \$1,500

s. 10	Source of Income; Marital Status; Family Status	<i>Birchall v. Guardian Properties Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 36</a>	C was a single mother who received disability benefits. A landlord refused to rent to her when he found out about her receipt of benefits. He believed she could not afford the rent, but this wasn't true. Given that the amount she received was determined by her status as a single parent, the Tribunal concluded this was discrimination based on source of income as well as marital and family status.	I2D: \$2000  \$180 in compensation for expenses (higher rent).
<b>s. 12 – Wages</b>				
<b>Sex (Gender)</b>				
s. 12 (also s. 13)	Sex (Gender)	<i>Pennock v. Centre City Drywall (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 192</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Kraska v. Pennock</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCSC 109</a> : BCHRT decision upheld	C asserted she was paid less than men doing the same or similar work. Parties were part of an extended family.	I2D: to be agreed upon by the parties  LW: Wage differential for last 12 months (the maximum under s.12). Parties are to resolve the compensatory issues themselves (Tribunal to remain seized if parties unable to resolve)
<b>S. 13 - Employment</b>				
<b>Age</b>				
s. 13	Age	<i>Gibbons v. CML Contracting and another</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 220</a>	C was employed as a tree climber at R, a landscaping business. After C had a workplace injury when he was 47 years old, R did not allow C a graduated return to work and	I2D: \$22,500  LW: \$8,000

			terminated his employment. R manager told C's physiotherapist that C was "too old and too much of a liability for another injury", among other comments about C's age. The Tribunal found that R's preference for younger workers was not a bona fide occupational requirement.	
s. 13	Age	<i>Prom v. Verka Food International Ltd. and another</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 130</a>	R employer, not satisfied with C's work performance, called C "old and slow" in a meeting and later replaced him with a younger worker. Tribunal found discrimination based on age.	I2D: \$3,000 LW: \$ 18,750
s. 13	Age	<i>Harder v. Tupas-Singh and another</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 50</a>	C's employment was terminated at the age of 59. Discrimination was found since C's age was a factor in the employer's decision to fire C, even though there were other and perhaps more significant factors that also motivated the termination.	I2D: \$4,000 LW: \$5,102
s. 13	Age	<i>McNair v. International House</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 123</a>	C succeeded in establishing that his age was a factor in R's decision to terminate his employment. R could not provide a justification for termination based on age.	I2D: \$6,000 and post-judgement interest LW: \$11,214 and pre-judgement interest
s. 13	Age	<i>Price v. Top Line Roofing</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 306</a>	The hiring of a younger journeyman and two apprentices followed shortly by C's lay-off of C allowed the Tribunal to reasonably infer that age was a factor in C losing his job.	No I2D as C did not seek an award LW: \$11,861.48 (equal to two months' wages)
s. 13	Age	<i>Buchanan v. WMC Management Services</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 339</a>	C was an employee for 30 years who turned 60 years of age. During annual review was asked if going to retire. Said not until 65. Same	I2D: \$7,500 & post-judgement interest LW: \$5,141.01 & pre-judgement interest

			conversation happened shortly thereafter and she was terminated.	
s. 13	<b>Age; Family Status; Marital Status</b>	<i>McGregor v. Morelli and Quarterway Hotel</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 277</a>	Job applicant asked questions about her age, marital status, and family status, then screened out of selection process.	I2D: \$500 and post-judgement interest
s. 13	<b>Age</b>	<i>Miu v. Vanart Aluminum and Tam</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 219</a>	40-year old C responded to ad for a “young trainee”. Was told by R that they were looking for someone younger.	I2D: \$2,500
s. 13	<b>Age</b>	<i>Tate v. West Telemarketing</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 530</a>	C was denied promotions based on his age and then quit.	I2D: \$2,500 LW: \$1,500
s. 13	<b>Age</b>	<i>Perk v. Seel</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 277</a>	New owners took over restaurant, hired younger staff and fired C, a 56-year old waitress.	I2D: \$3,000 LW: \$14,642.75 & post-judgement interest Expenses: \$1,400 for moving expenses & post-judgement interest; \$150 to attend the hearing
<b>Criminal Conviction</b>				
s. 13	<b>Criminal Conviction</b>	<i>Mr. T v. Silver Bullet Solutions</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 141</a>	C worked for R for seven days. His employment was terminated immediately after R learned he had two prior criminal convictions that he had not disclosed during the hiring process. The Tribunal found that C’s	I2D: \$10,000 (post-judgment interest)

			criminal convictions were a factor in his termination and were unrelated to his employment. However, the Tribunal also found that C's employment would have been terminated regardless of his convictions. As a result, his claim for wage loss was denied.	
<b>Family Status</b>				
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Christensen v. Save-a-Lot Holdings Corp. (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 125</a>	Cs were siblings. Cs' father was one of the directors of R company, where Cs also worked. After a fallout within the company regarding Cs' father's performance, Cs were terminated at the same time as their father. Tribunal dismissed R's reason that Cs worked poorly and were grossly overpaid, and found that Cs' family status was a factor in the dismissal given the circumstances, including the timing of dismissal.	I2D: \$10,000 each for the two Cs  LW: \$10,500 each for the two Cs
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Cavanaugh v. Sea to Sky Hotel and Mohajer (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 209</a>	During her termination meeting, C was told that she would be more suitable to a less demanding job with regular hours, because of her family status (single mother).	I2D: \$4,000 and post-judgement interest  LW: \$8,000 and pre-judgement interest
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Beaton v. Tolko Industries</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 229</a>	R paid C less vacation pay than he was entitled to because he was absent from work in 2005 on a parental leave.	I2D: \$3,500 and post-judgement interest  LW: One day's wages to attend the hearing

				Loss of vacation pay: \$2,125.82 with pre and post-judgement interest
s. 13	Family Status	<i>Thomson v. Eurocan Pulp &amp; Paper Company</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 32</a>	R hired students for summer employment and reserved 90% of the positions for children of current employees.	I2D: \$1,000
s. 13	Family Status	<i>Bellefleur v. District of Campbell River Fire Department</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 12</a> (merits); <i>Bellefleur v. District of Campbell River Fire Department (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 28</a> (remedy); See also <i>Bellefleur v. District of Campbell River Fire Department (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 541</a>  Judicial Review – <i>The District of Campbell River v. Bellefleur</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCSC 1109</a> : BCHRT decision on remedy overturned  Appeal – <i>Campbell River (District) v. Bellefleur</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCCA 601</a> : Appeal of BCSC decision allowed, Tribunal remedy reinstated	C was not hired because he was the son of a firefighter who was disliked by the chief. Successful applicants were no more qualified than C.	Order that C be hired and placed on R's seniority list as if he had been hired at the time of his application

<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Family Status</b>	<i>Campbell v. Fereidoun Shahrestani</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 36</a>	C was replaced permanently whilst on maternity leave. Agreed terms of leave disputed between C and R (employer). The Tribunal found discrimination.	I2D: \$1,500 (C sought \$3,500) LW: \$7,420 Expenses: \$482.39 for accommodation, meals, and travel expenses for C and her family to attend the hearing
<b>Marital Status</b>				
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Marital Status</b>	<i>Martin v. Grapevine Optical and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 76</a>	C and her husband both worked for R. C's husband quit his job and filed a WorkSafe complaint against R following an altercation with the employer. C's employment was terminated weeks later. Tribunal found that C's marriage was a factor in her dismissal.	I2D: \$20,000 LW: \$50,836.53 Expenses: \$245.02 Costs: \$250
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Marital Status; Physical Disability; Mental Disability</b>	<i>Metcalfe v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 882 and others (No. 9)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 512</a>	C was removed from her health and welfare benefits while receiving treatment for illness after STD benefits ended.	I2D: \$1,000 Order that R compensate for half of the premiums of C's benefit package equalling \$1,769.44
<b>Mental Disability</b>				
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Aolick v. A1 Convenience Store and others (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 62</a>	C got a job working at R's convenience store via an employment agency that assisted people with disabilities. The employment agency subsidized her wage for a period. Employer R discriminated against C when it did not let C bring her	I2D: \$35,000 LW: \$3,866.21 Expenses: \$601.80 Costs: \$500

			service dog to work, made hurtful comments related to her disabilities, and terminated her employment four months after the wage subsidy ended.	(prejudgment interest on wage loss and expenses, post-judgment interest on all awards)
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Varghese v. Dueck Richmond Chevrolet Buick Cadillac GMC Ltd. (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 219</a>	C experienced symptoms of mental illness at work. R called emergency services and C was detained under the <i>Mental Health Act</i> . While he was being detained by law enforcement, R handed C a termination letter. The Tribunal found that R perceived C to be having symptoms associated with a mental disability, even if R was not aware of exactly what the disability was.	The Tribunal ordered no injury to dignity, lost wages, or other expenses incurred because C did not seek them. However, the Tribunal found that C's dignity was injured by R's conduct and he would have been entitled to compensation of this nature had he sought it.
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Christensen v. Caretenders Financial Services Inc., and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 212</a>	C was experiencing anxiety and depression. C provided notes to R indicating that she needed to be off work for approximately six weeks due to a medical condition and inquired about LTD benefits. R terminated C while she was on medical leave. R asserted that it terminated C for performance issues. The Tribunal found the timing of the termination, in light of the information the Rs had at the time about C's mental health, medical leave, and inquiry about LTD benefits, gave rise to an inference that C's mental disability was a factor in the termination decision.	I2D: \$15,000  LW: \$7884.63, plus an amount to offset additional income tax payable as a result of receiving a lump sum of lost wages  (prejudgment interest on wage loss, post-judgment interest on both awards)

s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>K. v. RMC Ready Mix Ltd. and another (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 108</a>	C worked as a salesperson in the construction industry. He had substance use and bipolar disorders. His employer, R, paid for him to attend treatment. He did, but then relapsed. He went to detox, and then felt ready to return to work. In order to return, R required C to take a drug test and sign an agreement that would require C to participate in random monthly drug testing for two years. C's employment was terminated when he refused to do both. The Tribunal found that R did not reasonably accommodate C because R refused to discuss the agreement with him in advance, and because the agreement did not reflect a proper treatment plan for C and alternative approaches were not explored.	I2D: \$20,000 LW: \$139,833.60
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Cyncora v. Axton Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 36</a>	C had Generalized Anxiety Disorder and Major Depressive Disorder. He missed a lot of work because of his disabilities. He didn't tell his employer about his disabilities because of the stigma surrounding mental illness. When he could no longer come to work at all, he told his employer he was struggling with mental health issues. However, the R had already decided to terminate his employment, and did so a few days later. The Tribunal said the R ought to have known that a medical condition might be impacting C's	I2D: \$20,000 Expenses: \$75 for steel toed boots C bought for work and were lost at the workplace after his termination. LW: \$2,962.50 (wage loss during job search and wage differential between job with R and new job)

			ability to work, and they had a duty to inquire before terminating him. They did not, so the termination was discriminatory.	
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Benton v. Richmond Plastics</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 82</a>	C was terminated on her first day of work after disclosing mental health issues and medications she was on to other employees. The CFO told her she was being fired because her medications and/or mental health made the CFO feel “uncomfortable”. The termination was devastating for C. She was unable to seek new work for the 16 months between the termination and the hearing and did not expect to be able to seek new work for a further 2 months.	I2D: \$30,000  LW: \$35,000, representing 12 months of wages. The Tribunal applied a one-third contingency to the C’s wage loss claim on the basis that she may not have remained employed by R for the full 18 months.
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Chen v. La Brass Foods</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 111</a>	C with schizoaffective and bipolar disorder was terminated by R, her employer. The Tribunal found C suffered adverse treatment during her employment, and that R breached the accommodation they offered (contributing to C’s extended hospitalization).	I2D: \$10,000  LW: \$1,301.14  Pre and post-judgement interest on LW; post-judgement interest on I2D.
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Wells v. Langley Senior Resources Society</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 59</a>	C, hired as executive director by R, suffered workplace bullying and harassment including perceived threats against her and her family, resulting in her developing a mental disability and taking a sick leave. C was subsequently terminated. The Tribunal found that R chose to keep C’s temporary replacement and fire	I2D: \$30,000 (C asked for \$100,000)  LW: To be determined with submissions in subsequent proceedings, by consent of the parties

			her for reasons including that she could not handle R's tough environment due to her disability.	
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Rassi v. Brighton College</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 29</a>	R terminated C after she went on stress leave and asked for a Record of Employment to receive Medical EI. C's contract stated that her commissions would be cancelled after four weeks of absence, which she interpreted as termination when this took place. R did nothing to dispel this impression.	I2D: \$10,000 LW: \$55,919.18
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Davis v. Sandringham Care Centre and another</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 148</a>	C suffered from PTSD and missed occasional days of work, was questioned about her past in a humiliating way, and put on medical leave without C's request or medical evidence of the necessity of doing so. The intrusive questioning itself was both discriminatory conduct and an unreasonable approach to ensuring the reasonable safety of residents and staff at the care facility.	I2D: \$35,000 LW: \$784.89 Expenses: \$1,539.98 for cost of attendance at hearing, including air fare from the United States and car rental
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Mackenzie v. Jace Holdings and another (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 376</a>	R dismissed C because of behaviour she exhibited, particularly mood swings, irritability and being manipulative, which were consistent with her diagnosis of adjustment disorder and depression. R had a duty to inquire into whether the behaviour exhibited by C was due to her mental disability and whether she required any accommodation. They did not fulfill that duty.	I2D: \$5,000 LW: \$17,600

<p><b>s. 13 (also s. 8)</b></p>	<p><b>Mental Disability</b></p>	<p><i>Kelly v. UBC (No. 3)</i>, <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 32</a>; <i>Kelly v. University of British Columbia (No. 4)</i>, <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 302</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>University of British Columbia v. Kelly</i>, <a href="#">2015 BCSC 1731</a>: BCHRT I2D award set aside and reconsideration ordered</p> <p>Appeal – <i>University of British Columbia v. Kelly</i>, <a href="#">2016 BCCA 271</a>: BCHRT I2D award restored</p>	<p>C was a resident doctor who was entitled to the reasonable accommodation of his disabilities within the learning (UBC Medical School) and work environment (UBC Hospital). The decisions to preclude C access to further remediation or probation, and to dismiss him from the program were discriminatory.</p>	<p>I2D: \$75,000 LW: \$380,000</p>
<p><b>s. 13</b></p>	<p><b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b></p>	<p><i>Fossum v. Society of Notaries (No. 2)</i>, <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 310</a></p>	<p>C, a notary public with an alcohol use disorder, had a relapse. R released an “Inquiry Notice” that used “disparaging” language respecting C’s alcoholism, and accepted C’s undertaking to undergo treatment and reporting (although C offered the undertaking). C suffered humiliation and loss of self-esteem.</p>	<p>I2D: \$5,000</p>
<p><b>s. 13</b></p>	<p><b>Mental Disability</b></p>	<p><i>Bowden v. Yellow Cab and others (No. 2)</i>, <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 14</a></p>	<p>R fired C in part because of her non-attendance at a meeting.</p> <p>R had a duty to accommodate C’s mental disability and, to take reasonable steps to inquire into whether his disability had any impact on his failure to attend the</p>	<p>I2D: \$10,000 LW: \$14,732</p>

			meeting. It would not have constituted undue hardship for it to make such an inquiry, and to consider any medical information his submitted in support of her absence.	
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Ford v. Peak Products Manufacturing and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 155</a>	R failed to reach point of undue hardship when it terminated C after 6 month absence for depression. Costs awarded for improper conduct after R aggressively pursued document disclosure before deadlines were set, made direct document request to C's doctor, and did so while C was unrepresented and suffering from anxiety and depression. R also aggressively pursued C's ex-husband as a witness even though they had divorced prior to the incident, had no relevant info to give, and C had safety concerns regarding the ex. R made this application in the middle of cross examination.	I2D: \$25,000  LW: \$11,781  Expenses: \$5,043.72 for courier, photocopying, witnesses attendance at the hearing, cost of medical reports, and travel costs to attend the hearing  Costs: 1/3 of legal expenses for improper conduct
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Bertrend v. Golder Associates</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 274</a>	C's disability, whether actual or as perceived by R, was a factor in the loss of her employment with R, who failed in their duty to inquire.	I2D: \$12,500  LW: \$12,000  Expenses: \$2,162.12 for photocopying of materials for hearing, air fare to attend hearing, parking, an expert's report and attendance at the hearing, and six days' lost wages to attend the hearing

s. 13	<b>Mental Disability; Race; Ancestry</b>	<i>Vasil v. Mongovius and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 117</a>	C had anorexia, dyslexia, and PTSD schizophrenic and borderline personality disorder. R had limited conception of money or pay arrangements due to disability. Rs did not keep track of C's work hours, did not provide him with accurate payroll documentation, allowed him to perform unpaid work at home, and paid him less than the ESA minimum wage.	I2D: \$10,000 LW: \$18,814.10 Costs: \$1,000
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Senyk v. WFG Agency Network (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 376</a>	Managers of R harassed C during the course of her employment resulting in a toxic work environment, and ultimately in C's physical and mental breakdown. C went on a medical leave, and did not return to active employment with R. C was terminated after a 2-year absence. The harassment was not connected to a protected characteristic and was therefore not discriminatory. However, the termination was discriminatory because it was due to her medical leave and R did not show it was justified in the circumstances.	I2D: \$35,000  Expenses: incurred as a result of the contravention including reasonable legal expenses
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Brady v. Interior Health Authority and Inaba (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 233</a>	R failed to fully investigate the possibility of hiring C before reaching the conclusion that it could not hire a pharmacist with a narcotics addiction. This is so even though R subsequently reinstated his application and continued with	I2D: to be determined between the parties (Tribunal to retain jurisdiction to hear arguments and decide the issue if necessary)

			the process of considering whether it could hire C.	
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Toivanen v. Electronic Arts (Canada) (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 396</a>	R doubled C's workload, creating stress and depression. C advised R that she would be taking stress leave and was terminated the next day.	I2D: \$20,000  Expenses: \$6,004.12 for healthcare costs; \$3,300 for legal expenses; \$1,000 for out of pocket expenses  Order that R pay C \$69,230.08 US for the loss of value of her stock options;  Severance pay \$19,744
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Fendick v. Lakes District Maintenance (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 573</a>	C had depression and anxiety, and his doctor recommended he work day shifts. R did not allow him to do so, scheduling him for all night shifts. C failed to mitigate by not enrolling in short and long term disability plans in a timely fashion.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: unspecified quantum - reduced by 40% due to C's failure to mitigate
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Gordy v. Painter's Lodge (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 225</a>	R did not allow C to return to work as a fishing guide due to mental and physical disability on the grounds that C's bipolar disorder was an unacceptable risk. R could have accommodated C as a fishing guide or in another position.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$5,000
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Madore v. Richard and another</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 104</a>	R found C unreliable at work because of his absences due to disability and terminated him.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: \$4,617.36

s. 13	<b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Morris v. BC Rail</i> <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 14</a>	C suffered from depression and was terminated while on medical leave in part because of his disability. C's disability affected his performance, causing his employer to be dissatisfied with him, and caused him to turn down work offered to him.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: unspecified quantum for approximately 23 months wages, plus pension contributions in the same period  Expenses: \$255 and \$1,240.40 for bringing the matter to hearing; \$2,000 for partial compensation for legal fees and disbursements
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Sylvester v. B.C. Society of Male Survivors of Sexual Abuse</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 14</a>	C required sick leave after a client died by suicide, sent a letter to R advising them she would be taking a medical leave but expected to return to work. R terminated her without inquiring into C's condition to see if she could be accommodated.	I2D: \$1,200  LW: unspecified quantum equal to one month's wages
s. 13	<b>Mental Disability; Physical Disability</b>	<i>Rafuse v. British Columbia (Ministry of Tourism)</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 42</a>	C hired to work at museum, suffered lung injury from asbestos exposure. R ordered C to report to work at a job site before confirming its suitability for his disability. R also suspended his STD/STIIP benefits due to reporting failures it knew were related to his mental disability, and attempted to collect money from C due to non-responsiveness when it had reason to suspect this was also because of the mental disability. C was in fragile emotional state and vulnerable.	I2D: \$6,500 (C asked for \$15,000, \$5,000 per allegation)
<b>Physical Disability</b>				

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Neske v. Sobeys Inc. (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 37</a>	C was a pharmacy manager. While C was on a gradual return to work plan due to surgery, R eliminated her position and demoted her. The Tribunal found that the R's conduct was due, at least in part, to concerns about C's disability-related inability to work full-time hours. R did not prove that it considered C's specific disability-related needs and whether she could perform her role on a reduced hours basis. R did not prove that it investigated other options or considered whether it could take any other reasonable or practical steps to avoid adversely impacting C. R's conduct was discriminatory and was not justified.	I2D: \$50,000 LW: \$78,354.12  (prejudgment interest on lost wages, post-judgment interest on both awards)  Costs: \$15,000
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Thandi v. BC Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General, Corrections Branch, North Fraser Pretrial Centre</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 294</a>	C was a correctional officer. C was injured in a series of car accidents and went on medical leave. C was able to return to work with modified duties. One of C's temporary restrictions was limited contact with inmates. R said it could not have accommodated this restriction without experiencing undue hardship. R did not permit C to return to work. The Tribunal found that the R took an all-or-nothing approach, requiring C to be able to immediately perform the full, regular duties of a CO to be eligible for any accommodation at all, with no allowance for temporary	I2D: \$18,000 LW: \$19,712 Expenses: \$3732.28  (prejudgment interest on wage loss and expenses; post-judgment interest on all amounts)  C ordered reinstated if she wishes to return to work. R and C to make good faith and reasonable efforts towards a gradual return to work plan.

			modifications or exceptions. The R did not fulfill its duty to accommodate.	
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Zheng v. Kimberlite (Canada) International Business Inc and another</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 260</a>	C had a breathing-related disability. C repeatedly raised concerns with R about the air quality in her workplace. One day, C came to work and experienced significant breathing difficulties. R sent C home and indicated that it would look into servicing the store's HVAC. R did not provide any documentation to C confirming that it had addressed the air quality in the workplace. C did not return to work. R terminated C eleven months after her last day of work. The Tribunal found that the termination was discriminatory.	I2D: \$20,000  LW: \$76,343.18  (pre-judgment interest on wage loss, post-judgment interest on both awards)
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Gbedze v. Hilton Vancouver Metrotown (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 225</a>	C sustained a permanent injury at work and could not return to his job as a chef in a large hotel. R was aware of C's desire to return to work but did not request medical information from C to assess his ability to return to work with modified duties or in a different position. The Tribunal found that R was a full-service hotel with a range of other positions that could have been explored for C. It was the R's responsibility to collect relevant information and identify options to accommodate C. The R fell short in this responsibility by limiting its inquiry to C's ability to participate in a gradual return to work as a chef.	I2D: \$32,000  LW: \$16,617.91  (pre and post judgment interest)

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Champagne v. Synergy Day Spa and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 174</a>	R terminated C's employment after she provided a doctor's note stating she required an eight-week medical leave.	I2D: \$5000 LW: \$3551.85  (prejudgment interest on wage loss award, post-judgment interest on all awards)
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Shahbakhshi v. Melo and another</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 87</a>	C, a Deaf person, applied for a laser technician position at R beauty salon. R owner had a brief interview with C through a Sign language interpreter, and quickly decided not to hire C. The Tribunal found that the owner had not realized that C was Deaf before the interview, and C's disability was a factor in the owner's decision.	I2D: \$15,000
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Flynn v. DF Architecture Inc. (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 81</a>	C was immunocompromised, which the Tribunal found constituted a physical disability. During the Covid-19 pandemic, R employer had an in-office work schedule. C, a new hire at the time, communicated his health issue to the employer and requested accommodation. The employer did not agree to changing his work schedule. C then resigned. The Tribunal found that R employer failed to provide reasonable accommodation.	I2D: \$25,000 LW: \$183,802.59
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Jickling v. Sweet Meadows Market (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 325</a>	During Covid, C, a probationary employee, self-isolated twice due to suspected Covid symptoms, each time for ten days following guidelines and a doctor's advice. R	I2D: \$40,000 Expenses: \$1,825.36

			employer fired C just as she started the second leave, for reasons related to her availability and performance. The Tribunal found that C's Covid-related leaves were protected on the ground of disability, and her leaves were a factor in the employer's decision to fire her.	
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Singh v A &amp; M Enterprise</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 148</a>	C was injured at work and took medical leave. Both before and while he was on leave, the employer found errors in C's work. Without further investigation, the manager fired C due to alleged past and current performance concerns, five days after C's return to work. The Tribunal found that the manager was always skeptical about C's injury, and C's disability was a factor in the decision to terminate him.	I2D: \$15,000  LW: \$13,750, less one week's wages paid at the time of termination
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Kasagoni v. J Singh Enterprises dba Willingdon Husky and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 65</a>	C suffered an injury at work, which left her with chronic pain. R believed that C lied about the injury happening at work, and he threatened to discontinue his support for C's permanent residence application if C did not withdraw her WorkSafe claim. While C was away because of the injury, R communicated to WorkSafe that C could not return to her job. The Tribunal found that R's intimidating behaviour towards C following her injury constituted harassment, and that R effectively ended C's employment because of her	I2D: \$35,000  LW: \$24,517.17  Expenses: \$255  Costs: \$1,000 (for failure to disclose relevant documents)

			disability. The Tribunal also found that R exploited C's vulnerability as a new immigrant with no knowledge of her legal rights by failing to pay her for overtime, vacation, and stat holidays throughout her employment.	
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Mr. D v. Path General Contractors and another</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 46</a>	R terminated C's employment the day after learning that C had Hepatitis C.	I2D: \$18,500 LW: \$48,672
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Bayongan v. Shimmura and another</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 27</a>	C, a temporary foreign worker, was a caregiver for Rs. C was diagnosed with cancer and had to take time off due to treatment and symptoms, but she was able to return to work. While she was off, Rs refused to extend C's employer-specific work permit. When C's permit expired, she was effectively terminated. Consequently, C also lost the ability to work in Canada and her MSP coverage. The Tribunal found that C's disability was the only reason for Rs' conduct, and Rs failed to establish the justification that C's continuous employment (i.e., not taking time off) was a bona fide occupational requirement.	I2D: \$25,000 LW: \$19,360 Expenses: \$1,420 (fee to restore her work permit and MSP expenses)
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Banfield v. Strata Geodata Services Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 142</a>	C's employment was terminated after 4 months. C worked as a geologist and had knee pain that she experienced at work. R claimed that they fired her because she had a negative attitude and did not have a good relationship with other employees. R also argued that C	I2D: \$10,000 LW: \$12,250

			could not proceed with her complaint because she had signed a release that released them from a human rights complaint. The Tribunal did not determine whether C's knee pain was a disability but determined that R perceived C to have a disability. The Tribunal found that C's perceived disability was a factor in her termination. The Tribunal also found that the release did not bar her human rights complaint.	
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Singh v. Dodd's Furniture (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 85</a>	C was the Assistant Manager of a furniture store when he injured his back. Upon return from medical leave, R informed C that they had filled his position. R gave C an ultimatum to either resign or take a new position that was a demotion and more physically demanding but had the same pay. The Tribunal found R could have reinstated C in his original position with reasonable accommodations and discriminated against C by assigning him to a new position without his input.	I2D: \$10,000
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Falconer v. Yard Hard Logging and another</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 38</a>	C had one leg amputated below the knee in 1999 and wore a prosthetic limb. He was employed by R as a machine operator. While on the job, another employee was severely injured on the worksite. In dealing with the accident, R tasked C with being the communications coordinator (communicating with	I2D: \$1,000 (HRT only awarded this amt because it was what C asked for, would have considered making higher award had it been sought) LW: None (C already recovered LW from ESB complaint)

			head office and helicopter rescue) while other employees physically attended to the injured employee. R refused to pay for the hours C spent at work in the communications coordinator role that day because he was not physically involved in the rescue. HRT found it reasonable to infer that the reason C was not paid was that R did not value C's work, because it was not physical.	
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Pacheco v. Local Pest Control Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 191</a>	C was terminated by R the day after an injury at work. C had asked for 2 weeks of medical leave.	I2D: \$7,500
s. 13	Physical Disability; Age	<i>He v. Kirin Mandarin Restaurant</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 112</a>	C was fired shortly after returning to work from an injury. R kept an employee that had taken over C's duties. The Tribunal inferred that R no longer wanted to employ C in part because it had a cheaper, able-bodied employee already performing the full duties of her position.	I2D: \$6,000 No LW due to C's failure to mitigate
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Gebresadik v. Black Top Cabs</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 278</a>	C drove a taxi for R and was involved in a collision, sustaining a number of injuries. C was unable to fulfil his full duties (he had provided medical note to this effect) and was berated and suspended. Was not provided sufficient shifts with lighter duties.	I2D: \$15,000 LW: \$7,781.03 & pre and post-judgement interest Expenses: \$200 for cost of medical report Costs: \$500
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Haftbaradaran v. Saturna Beach Estates</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 184</a>	C worked as wine maker and lost part of his finger in an accident at work, resulting in an inability to perform duties. Went on leave while	I2D: not specified, deferred pending further submissions on remedy

			receiving WCB awarded therapy treatments. Eventually terminated for failure to perform duties.	(subsequently fixed at \$15,000 - see <i>Haftbaradaran v. Saturna Beach Estates (No 2)</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 271</a> )
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Dunkley v. UBC and another</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 100</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Providence Health Care v. Dunkley</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCSC 1383</a> : BCHRT decision upheld	Deaf C was denied an interpreter for her residency at St. Paul’s Hospital while in the UBC medical program.	I2D: \$35,000  LW: unspecified quantum for approximately seven months of wages  Expenses: \$500 for reimbursement of attendance a Dermatology Conference  Unspecified quantum for university and application fees; unspecified quantum for C to re-acquire physiotherapy license and insurance
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Mental Disability; Sexual Orientation</b>	<i>Garneau v. Buy-Rite Foods and others</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 77</a>	C was bullied because he was seen as weak and vulnerable. His physical and mental disabilities and perceived sexual orientation were significant factors in his treatment.	I2D: \$15,000  LW: \$936 for one month of wages
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Edwards v. 0720941 B.C. Ltd. and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 59</a>	Truck driver C fired due to absences arising from surgery, as indicated on his Record of Employment. C claimed depression, anxiety, and marital problems as a result but provided no medical evidence.	I2D: \$5,000
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Tervit v. Canadian College of English</i>	C, a teacher, was not returned to work after medical absence.	I2D: \$6,500

		<i>Language</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 53</a>		LW: \$1,500  Expenses: \$169 (for unspecified costs)
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Mental Disability</b>	<i>Alagaratnam v. Metropolitan Hotel Vancouver</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 251</a>	C's short-term disability benefits were cancelled due to R's inadequate discussion with doctor. Complaint based on termination of C's employment was dismissed.	I2D: \$5,000  Loss of short term disability benefits \$6,517
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Bouchard v. Cambie Malone Group and another</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 130</a>	C was not returned to same work due to R's perception of disability and limitations, despite medical evidence not indicating any restrictions or limitations.	I2D: \$7,000  LW: \$24,500
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Mental Disability</b>	<i>McConachie v. Metasoft Systems</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 129</a>	C was undergoing cancer treatment. R contravened the Code at multiple times: with an e-mail requiring that C meet certain quotas; with the warning that she would be terminated if she communicated directly with the R's Sales Manager; when it reported to the sales team that she had "finished at 0% of her quota;" when R threatened to terminate her if she failed to meet her sales quota; and, when it denied C a Vegas trip given to sales reps after achieving five years of service.	I2D: \$20,000  Loss of employee Las Vegas trip: \$800
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Davidson v. O'Brien Road and Bridge Maintenance and another</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 123</a>	C was terminated at least in part because of Rs' perception that the physical manifestations of his arthritis made him less capable than other workers in a significant and long-lasting way.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: \$4,800

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>McGowan v. Pretty Estates</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 40</a>	C worked as a server for R and required time off due to a wrist sprain. R accused C of lying and fired her. Timing and stated reasons for dismissal indicate that disability was the “last straw” before the termination.	I2D: \$5,000  Expenses: \$1,808.46 for legal advice C paid for prior to filing her claim
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Political Belief</b>	<i>Wali v. Jace Holdings</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 389</a>	C was terminated because of his disability and for expressing his beliefs about a new legislative initiative, which constituted a political belief. This resulted in new and additional damage to his dignity, feelings and self-respect.	I2D: \$10,000  LW and vacation pay: unspecified quantum for four weeks’ wages, quantum to be determined between the parties. Tribunal to retain jurisdiction to hear arguments and decide the issue if necessary  Pre and post -judgement interest
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Hunter v. Centanni Tile (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 352</a>	C fired after he notified employer of need for surgery and 2 month recuperation. R fired C allegedly because sales were slow and did not replace him for a year, but the timing of the termination suggests the Physical disability was also a factor.	I2D: \$6,500  No LW as the parties previously reached settlement on this issue
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Winkelmeyer v. Woodlands Inn and Suites</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 312</a>	C’s disability was a factor in R denying him a job interview.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$1,706.25  Post-judgment interest on I2D; pre and post-judgement interest on LW

s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Smith v. Triack Resources</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 294</a>	C was terminated in part for stumbling into the “stop” button on a piece of machinery, an error directly linked to C’s disability. R made no enquiries respecting whether his performance issues were connected with his injuries.	I2D: \$7,500 Expenses: \$3,630.54 for attendance of expert witness
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Bateman v. Prime Time Sports</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 230</a>	C was not returned to work after surgery. R kept on C’s replacement instead.	I2D: \$5,000 LW: \$5,088
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Khalil v. Woori Education Group</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 186</a>	Blind C applied for job with R but was denied a second interview when he disclosed his disability, although he could do the job.	I2D: \$3,000
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Malin v. Ultra Care and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 158</a>	C only offered one more day of work after R was made aware of his HIV positive status.	I2D: \$20,000 LW: \$6,877 Costs: \$500 (for R’s failure to provide disclosure)
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Mould v. JACE Holdings (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 77</a>	C was absent from work for 30 months due to her disability.  The Tribunal found that R decided to terminate her employment without asking her for any medical information to establish her restrictions and limitations, and without considering whether there was alternative employment she could do despite her restrictions. This constituted a failure to accommodate.	I2D: \$5,000

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Sikora v. Rebo Beton Pumping</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 29</a>	C suffered a thumb injury at work. After returning on a graduated return to work plan, C re-aggravated his thumb injury and R terminated him a day later.  R dismissed C because it was aware of, and concerned about, its own conduct contributing to the re-aggravation.	I2D: \$1,000  LW: \$1,000 - reduced due to lack of mitigation  Expenses: \$4,627.16 for expenses incurred to pursue complaint and attend hearing
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Holt v. Coast Mountain Bus Company</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 28</a>	R failed to accommodate C's neck condition by permitting him to drive a particular model of bus which did not aggravate that condition.	No I2D as C contributed substantially to his own difficulties and provided scant evidence of the impact of the discrimination on him  No LW due to C's failure to mitigate (See para. 231 of Reasons)  R ordered to cease contravention
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Morris v. ACL Services</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 6</a>	C was terminated due to his disability-related absence, and inability to return to work in the foreseeable future.	I2D: \$10,000  Expenses: Reimbursement for C's medical costs that would have been covered by R's employee benefits plan
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Age</b>	<i>Lee v. Strata Plan 4082 and others</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 3</a>	C was fired 2 days after requesting an accommodation for his disability, which affected his ability to respond to emergency situations. Despite other workplace issues, his disability and its relationship to his	I2D: \$6,500  LW: \$37,913.17

			emergency duties was at least a factor in his termination.	
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Hope v. Northern Health Authority</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 344</a>	R failed to establish a bona fide occupational requirement defence to justify not returning C to work (due to C's physical disability, during two periods of time).	I2D: \$7,500  LW: unspecified quantum for approximately one month's wages
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Hoang v. North-West Produce</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 85</a>	C disability was a factor in the termination of his employment.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: \$2,500
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Kaur obo Sarain v. Wingtat Game Bird Packers</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 84</a>	Injured C returning to work fired when he requested 3 day work week to accommodate in part his injury, in accordance with a doctor's note.	I2D: \$7,500  LW: unspecified quantum for approximately five month's wages - quantum to be determined between the parties. Tribunal to retain jurisdiction to seek submissions on the issue if necessary
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Retaliation</b>	<i>Cartwright v. Rona and another</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 65</a>	R discriminated against C by refusing to allow him to return to his job after he injured his back because they perceived him to have a disability- a weak back that might be susceptible to further injury. Retaliation occurred when a manager of R yelled at C, had him escorted off the property, and threatened to call police when C tried to deliver list of witnesses prior to hearing.	I2D: \$4,000 (discrimination), \$4,000 (retaliation)  LW: \$1,600  Expenses: \$475 for a security guard course which enabled C to find replacement employment
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>McKenna v. Atlas Anchor Systems (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 60</a>	R terminated C while he was away on medical leave. Although R did suffer economic hardship to	I2D: \$2,000  LW: \$4,181.57

			employer, it did not reach level of undue hardship.	Expenses: \$375.53 for various items
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Barton v. Garrison and another</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 39</a>	R refused to permit C to return to work, effectively terminating his employment while absent from work due to his disability.	I2D: \$7,500  Expenses: \$1,631 for loss of one week's salary to attend the hearing, travel expenses to attend the hearing, and obtaining medical reports and documents filed in evidence
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Schmidt v. City Furniture and another</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 321</a>	C fell ill with viral pneumonia. She called R to advise them she could not work, after which R advised her that they would be hiring someone else. C made statement acquiescing to this. However, R had conflicting information about C's intention and was not entitled to interpret this as a resignation, as C subsequently provided a doctor's note indicating she would be returning in 2 weeks.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: \$7,631.05
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Vernon v. Howatt Enterprises and others</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 313</a>	C had one arm. Rs engaged in a concerted effort to have C resign from work. They made her job more difficult by creating work that they knew she would find challenging because of her disability due to concern about her ability to perform all aspects of her job and to keep up with the upcoming summer demands. Rs referred to C as a "one-armed bandit".	I2D: \$15,000  LW: \$21,060

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Johnson v. D &amp; B Traffic Control and another</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 287</a>	Overweight C was told that due to his “disability”, he would not be scheduled to work. Found that R had perception that C was disabled and this in part was reason for denial of work. The Tribunal held that C did not have a disability (being overweight did not qualify) but that R nevertheless perceived him as such by virtue of referring to “his disability”.	I2D: \$2,000
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>McBride v. Orca Sand &amp; Gravel and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 190</a>	Discrimination when C’s hours reduced to 24 hours from 32 while on medical leave. This disintitiled her to extended medical benefits as 25 hours were required to qualify.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: unspecified quantum for differential in wages from 24 hrs to 32 hours weekly for 4 months, quantum to be determined between the parties. Tribunal to retain jurisdiction to determine process to fix the this amount
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Hurn v. Healthquest and others</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 435</a>	C had MVA injuries and was fired four days into her new job when Rs fired her, stating they didn’t think she was “ready to work” and that R was “mopping the floor while you (C) were sitting on your ass”. C was particularly vulnerable as she was just re-entering workforce after long rehabilitation. Rs implied C was lazy, showed disregard for her disability, and criticized her in front of a customer.	I2D: \$8,000  LW: \$4140  Expenses: \$78.81 for costs of filing complaint and travelling to hearing

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<p><i>Morgan-Hung v. Provincial Health Services and others (No. 4)</i>, <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 371</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – Petition dismissed in Oral Reasons for judgement, June 17, 2010</p> <p>Appeal – <i>Morgan-Hung v. British Columbia (Human Rights Tribunal)</i>, <a href="#">2011 BCCA 122</a>: BCHRT remedy re medical expenses, lost wages, and removal of a “do not re-employ” notation on C’s record remitted for reconsideration</p>	R discriminated against C by reducing her status from full to part-time, poisoning the work environment through unfounded criticisms of her work and talking about her health condition with colleagues and, ultimately, leaving her no alternative but to resign from her position due to the discrimination.	I2D: \$10,000 LW: \$14,148  (see Judicial Review and Appeal note)
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>USWA v. Weyerhaeuser</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 328</a>	Four Cs on long term disability were terminated prior to closing of mill in order to preclude severance payments. Tribunal found this constituted discrimination.	I2D: Mr. Wakeling \$20,000; Mr. Icton 16,000; Mr. Cardoso \$14,000; Ms. Schellenberg \$5,000  Order that Cs be reinstated with seniority; severance pay in accordance with C’s seniority
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Mahowich v. Westgate Resorts and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 247</a>	C was denied the opportunity to return to work after submission of her doctor’s note, even though R	I2D: \$2,000 - reduced because C exaggerated her injury

			could have accommodated by providing her with a higher chair.	LW: \$3,547.60
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<p><i>Kerr v. Boehringer Ingelheim (Canada) (No. 4)</i>, <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 196</a></p> <p><i>Kerr v. Boehringer Ingelheim (Canada) (No. 5)</i>, <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 62</a> (issue of legal expenses)</p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>Boehringer Ingelheim (Canada) Ltd./Ltée. v. Kerr</i>, <a href="#">2010 BCSC 427</a>: BCHRT decision upheld</p> <p>Appeal – <i>Boehringer Ingelheim (Canada) Ltd./Ltée. v. Kerr</i>, <a href="#">2011 BCCA 266</a>: appeal of BCSC decision dismissed</p>	R failed to meet its obligation to accommodate C to the point of undue hardship. The steps that it took to accommodate were procedurally deficient and provided no substantive results for C.	<p>I2D: \$30,000</p> <p>LW: \$352,898.02</p> <p>Contribution to Pension Bonuses: \$60,000</p> <p>Expenses: unspecified quantum for legal fees incurred prior to filing of complaint, quantum to be determined between the parties. Tribunal seized of the issue for 60 days.</p>
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Roberts v. T. MacRae Family Sales and MacRae</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 181</a>	C injured his eye at work and became light sensitive. R gave him indoor work away from light for a month, then reduced him to one shift per week, then removed him from the work schedule and issued an ROE indicating C had quit. Rs failed to take procedural steps necessary to determine if accommodation was possible.	No I2D as C did not seek an award

s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Wyse v. Coastal Wood Industries</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 180</a>	R failed to make inquiries about C's medical conditions and restrictions, and to use that information to explore accommodation options. R issued a Record of Employment saying C had quit, even though he had explained that he wanted to apply for medical EI benefits.	I2D: \$5,000 LW: \$23,107 Expenses: \$1736.92 for cost of expert
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Matonovich v. Candu Glass and Marklund (No. 6)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 145</a>	C suffered from back and spine issues decreasing ability to work, terminated by R in part because of this. C's benefits were terminated, causing additional stress and financial uncertainty. However, Rs took some steps to accommodate and maintain that C could return to work when she got better. Rs also did not cause medical condition. C was ultimately unable to work after termination.	I2D: \$5,000 Expenses: \$116.06 for prescriptions C would have had covered by R's employee group insurer
s. 13	Physical Disability; Mental Disability	<i>Mills v. Norex Civil Contractors and Reutlinger</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 99</a>	C suffered from a significant brain injury but had recovered sufficiently to work. C was terminated because other employees of R were uncomfortable having him on site due to his disability.	No I2D as C did not seek an award
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Gaarden v. Fountain Tire and Ingram</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 402</a>	C's employment terminated after 5 months on WCB medical leave. R unsuccessfully argued that C had abandoned his job.	I2D: \$6,000 Expenses: \$1020.11 for expenses arising from the contravention
s. 13	Physical Disability; Age	<i>Flores v. Duso Enterprises and Duso (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 368</a>	After returning from a medical leave, C was introduced to a much younger and stronger man who had begun working in his department while he was on leave. C's	I2D: \$7,500 LW: \$8,040.80

			employment was terminated shortly after. Mr. Flores was 59 years old at the time. Timing of termination and hiring of stronger, younger replacement lead to inference of discrimination.	
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability; Age</b>	<i>McComb v. Yaletown Restoration and Aziz</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 320</a>	C was ready and able to return to work without accommodation, she was perceived by R as having a disability, such that he was reluctant to have her return to work. R lost confidence in C as an employee, in part because of perceived disability.	I2D: \$5,000 LW: \$13,800
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Cassidy v. Emergency Health and Services Commission and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 125</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Emergency Health Services Commission v. Cassidy</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCSC 1003</a> : BCHRT directed to reconsider whether R reasonably accommodated C  Tribunal Reconsideration – <i>Cassidy v. Emergency Health Services Commission and another (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 116</a> : BCHRT I2D award confirmed as appropriate	C, a paramedic, suffered from MS such that his hands were unable to palpate pulses. R could not substantively have accommodated C's disability in the paramedic position without undue hardship. However, R failed to treat C with dignity and respect in the accommodation process including unnecessarily delaying effective accommodation in a different position.	I2D: \$22,500  LW: \$35,390.02 and other remedies awarded in <i>Cassidy v. Emergency and Health Services Commission and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 110</a>

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<p><i>National Automobile, Aerospace, Transportation and General Workers of Canada (CAW - Canada) Local 111 v. Coast Mountain Bus Company (No. 9)</i>, <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 52</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>Coast Mountain Bus v. CAW-Canada</i>, <a href="#">2009 BCSC 396</a>: BCHRT decision quashed in part</p> <p>Appeal – <i>Coast Mountain Bus Company Ltd. v. National Automobile, Aerospace, Transportation and General Workers of Canada (CAW-Canada), Local 111</i>, <a href="#">2010 BCCA 447</a>: BCHRT award for damages reconfirmed</p>	<p>Union C filed on behalf of its members employed by R who had been placed in “Attendance Management Programs” because of their higher than average non-culpable absenteeism rates arising from their disabilities.</p> <p>Accommodation within an attendance standard is no different than accommodation within any other standard that is applicable in a workplace. A mandatory attendance plan is discriminatory because it does not take into account individual circumstances. In this case, the approach ignored the stress and anxiety of employees placed on the AMP as well as the anger and frustration of having a disability seemingly ignored.</p>	I2D: Various individual Cs given \$5,000 - \$6,000
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Mental Disability</b>	<i>Wilson v. Transparent Glazing Systems (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 50</a>	R discriminated against C when they terminated his employment without making necessary inquiries, when it knew that he had a disability and was taking medical marijuana. R attributed what it thought was C’s impairment to his medication, without making inquiries. This was a factor in the termination.	I2D: \$500

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Lowe v. William L. Rutherford (B.C.) and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 336</a>	C was terminated after missing several days of work due to Crohn's disease. R knew of the disability and absences, but terminated without inquiring or attempting to accommodate. C additionally was classified as a casual rather than regular employee by R and paid "under the table". He requested a change to regular status but this was denied because of his illness.	I2D: \$20,000 LW: \$14,500 Lost Benefits: \$11,961.08 for benefits C would have had covered by R's employee benefits plan
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Datt v. McDonald's Restaurants (No.3)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 324</a>	C, a 23 year employee, suffered from eczema on her hands. R had policy requiring "frequent" hand washing which exacerbated C's condition. R claimed that this precluded C from returning to work. C alleged R failed to accommodate with respect to establishing what "frequent" meant, and failed to consider other jobs or training her for management.	I2D: \$25,000 LW: \$23,078.09 Lost profit sharing: \$1,822.73 Expenses: \$400 for medical and dental expense; \$225 for lost wages to attend the hearing. Pre-judgment interest on LW and expenses; post-judgement interest on all awards.
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Millar v. Sterling Fence</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 249</a>	C was on medical leave and receiving WCB benefits for 5 weeks when he was terminated. Rs believed they could terminate an employee who was unable to work due to injury.	I2D: \$2,000

s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Chong v. Violetta Industries and Sommerville (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 163</a>	Employer denied C specific shift requests to ameliorate the effects of his MS. C quit because of the stress of being denied request, which exacerbated his MS.	I2D: \$7,500 LW: \$11,480
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Mikolas v. Travelodge Hotel and others</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 135</a>	C established that her disability was a factor in the withdrawal of a position previously offered to her. C was terminated because of a telephone conversation she had with a manager of R in which she criticized him, but did so because of injury related factors. This meant her disability was indirectly a factor in her termination.	I2D: \$2,000  No LW as C did not seek an award
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability; Mental Disability; Religion</b>	<i>Emerick v. Sooke Esso and Wattie</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 79</a>	R discriminated against C by not allowing him to use the till to the level of his ability, by not offering him the opportunity to see if he could learn to use the espresso machine, by requiring a guarantee that she would bear no responsibility should he have a seizure at work, by dismissing him on September 6 and October 15 because of seizures he had in the workplace, and by making derogatory comments to him based on her religious beliefs.	I2D: \$2,000  LW: \$600
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Matuszewski v. B.C. (Ministry of Competition, Science and Enterprise) (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 30</a>  Judicial Review –	As an injured worker on Long Term Disability Benefits, C did not accrue seniority, while active employees, employees on the Liquor Distribution Board's Short Term Illness and Injury Plan, and	I2D: \$2,500  LW: unspecified quantum for wages lost to attend the hearing  (see Judicial Review note)

		<i>HMTQ v. Matuszewski</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCSC 915</a> - BCHRT decision on remedies remitted for reconsideration.	employees on Workers Compensation benefits did.	
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Ingenthron v. Overwaitea Food Group and Van Pelt (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 556</a>	C suffered from a back injury. Rs failed to allow him to transfer work locations as allowed by his seniority. R argued it would constitute undue hardship to allow him to transfer, but did not obtain updated medical information or an occupational assessment of the store C proposed he could relocate to. The cost of this review would not have been undue hardship.	No I2D awarded.  Order that R transfer C to new work location and pursue accommodations.
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Ehret v. Shandro Investments (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 486</a>	C suffered a hand injury at work. R gave C tasks she could not perform due to her disability. Tribunal found that C was constructively dismissed when she left the work site due to extreme pressure from R.	I2D: \$7,500  LW: \$6,780
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Wiens v. West Telemarketing Canada and others</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 432</a>	C had to take frequent bathroom breaks due to diuretic medication, which was discussed by his team leader (R's employee) in front of the rest of the team, causing humiliation. Team leader should have known to discuss this in private.	I2D: \$1,700
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Halliday v. Craft Welders and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 373</a>	C had eye surgery which affected his ability to use machinery at work. Rs had C train his replacement, and then fired him. Rs failed to appear at the hearing.	I2D: \$7,500  LW: \$32,871.72  Expenses: \$792.95 for cost of expert report, travel

				to attend hearing and meet with counsel prior to the hearing, and having witnesses attend the hearing
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Wutke v. Mageria Holdings</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 340</a>	C had physical and mental disabilities and was using morphine to manage symptoms. C was ridiculed at work for symptoms of her mental disabilities, called a “retard” and “space cadet”, and told to stop coming in “high”. C left work crying, R treated this as a resignation.	I2D: \$6,000  LW: \$1,620  Expenses: \$500 for cost of expert report, obtaining and copying medical files, and having witnesses attend the hearing
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Britz v. Yaki's Pizza and Labossiere</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 245</a>	C disclosed the fact that she had epilepsy to R and was not hired because she could not be able to run the restaurant alone (a conclusion without factual basis). No consideration of accommodation.	I2D: \$2,000  LW: \$1,400
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Eastman v. Cornerstone Courier (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 209</a>	C, a courier, injured her back at work and was fired by R a day after telling R she had booked a doctor’s appointment. R’s testimony that C was fired for poor work performance was found not to be credible, and that C’s disability was a factor, if not the reason for the termination.	I2D: \$5,000
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Innes v. Re-Con Building Products</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 99</a>	C’s disability was aggravated by his job, requiring absence from work. R terminated C for absenteeism despite the fact that C had called in to notify in advance that he would be absent. C was unable to qualify for EI, STD or LTD benefits because R terminated him.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$21,476 and \$10,988.38  Expenses: \$1,980.45 for cost of expert report, attendance of witness at

				the hearing, and conduct money for witnesses at the hearing
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Russo v. Lions Gate Trailers and Vanderspek</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 18</a>	C was injured at work. Upon attempt to return, Rs had preserved C's position but failed to co-operate in finding reasonable accommodation. C indicated he was interested in a different position with R but R did not discuss this with him.	I2D: \$2,000  LW: \$7,891.20
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>MacRae v. Interfor (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 462</a>	R discriminated against C on the ground of Physical disability in terminating his employment to avoid paying him severance pay. C had been absent from work on LTD when he was terminated. Other employees who had been absent from the workplace (because it had been shut down) retained their employee status and thus their entitlement to severance pay.	I2D: \$12,500  Lost Severance: \$64,456  Expenses: \$1310.67. \$799 for expert report and \$511.67 for pre-hearing examination of a witness  (C reinstated for purposes of receiving severance)
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Cardamone v. Crown West Steel Fabricators and Heuthorst (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 369</a>	C had minor surgery to prepare for kidney dialysis and was laid off after arranging for light duties upon return, even though he could do other work.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$2,782.03 for wage differential  Expenses: \$1,653.78 for benefits C would have had covered by R's employee benefits plan
s. 13	<b>Physical Disability</b>	<i>Roberts v. Slocan Forest Products</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 206</a>	C had permanent nerve damage in his forearms preventing repetitive motions. C began to be passed over for shifts in favour of junior employees despite having seniority.	No I2D awarded  LW: unspecified quantum for three shifts

			R failed to consider if there was work that C could go.	
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Fenton v. Rona Revy Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 143</a>	C was on LTD when the company was sold. R, the purchaser, refused to continue her employment as well as that of any employees on LTD. R failed to consider the individual circumstances of these employees.	I2D: \$10,000  LW: quantum not specified  Medical expenses C would have had covered by R's employee benefits  Expenses: \$83.90 for travel expenses; \$142.85 for disbursements; \$60 for gasoline; \$100 for medical report; \$753.59 for costs to find new employment
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Poonia v. Sovereign Yachts (Canada) Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 69</a>	C suffered workplace injury to left leg. R told C to stay away from work until fully recovered without considering light duties. C returned to work with a limp at same duties, but R fired him 3 days later.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$52,487.55
s. 13	Physical Disability; Age	<i>Comeau v. Cote and Murphy Pipeline Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 32</a>	65 year old C, labourer with heart condition, was laid off due in part to his health. After-acquired cause could not justify termination.	I2D: \$3,500 (C asked for \$5,000)  LW: \$13,860 (estimate of how long C would have continued to work on the project)
s. 13	Physical Disability; Mental Disability	<i>Tozer v. British Columbia (Motor Vehicle Branch)</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 3</a> ; See also <i>Tozer v. British Columbia (Motor Vehicle Branch)</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 11</a> (lost wages)	C suffered a stroke and brain aneurysm, was forced on medical leave (alternative was dismissal) and not permitted to return to work until pronounced fit, was never returned. R's treatment of C s callous and high-handed, R ignored	I2D: \$3,500  LW: \$13,061.01 to be provided with interest compounding semi-annually

			solutions C proposed. R later hired C part time but this did not ameliorate the harm, C was ostracized in the office and not given work or spoken to.	
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Martin v. Carter Chevrolet Oldsmobile</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 37</a>	C terminated 3 weeks after hip replacement surgery. R argued she failed to work to required standard. The Tribunal found discrimination due to failure to inquire.	I2D: \$1,000  LW: \$2,219.73 with interest  Expenses: \$954.86 for lost wages to attend the hearing
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Wu v. Ellery Manufacturing</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 53</a>	C suffered a hand injury and could not work full time, was laid off. C subsequently was found unable to work as a machinist but R did not consider accommodation in alternative positions.	I2D: \$1,500 (C asked for \$10,000)
s. 13	Physical Disability	<i>Poulin v. Quintette Operating Corporation</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 48</a>	Truck driver C injured and transferred to lower paying job. R failed to consider full range of jobs C could do.	I2D: \$1,200 (C asked for \$1,500)  Loss of opportunity \$5,000 (C was not considered for other jobs, including ones with higher wages)
<b>Political Belief</b>				
s. 13	Political Belief	<i>Fraser v. BC (Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resources Operations) No. 4</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 140</a> and <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 195</a> (expenses decision)	C was a professional forester who held and expressed views about industry regulation and practice.  R revoked an offer of employment based in part on C's views. The	I2D: \$25,000 (C sought \$75,000 – R argued for \$5-10K)  Post-judgement interest on I2D until paid in full.

			<p>Tribunal found this was discriminatory.</p> <p>Tribunal dismissed another aspect of C's complaint (alleging a job offer was withheld while C was the first applicant on an eligibility list), citing lack of adverse effect.</p>	<p>Expenses: \$4,439.04</p> <p>Tribunal declined to order reinstatement of job or implementation of an anti-discrimination hiring policy.</p>
s. 13	Political Belief	<i>Bratzer v. Victoria Police Department (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 50</a>	<p>C was a Police Officer and spokesperson for an organization of Officers in favour of legalizing marijuana. His Department attempted to stop him making comments. The Tribunal found that the conduct of the Victoria Police Department in prohibiting C from attending at a Harm Reduction conference, directing him not to speak at the Green Party event, and letters from the Chief ordering him to stop speaking constituted discrimination contrary to the Code.</p>	<p>I2D: \$20,000</p> <p>LW: to be agreed upon by the parties with liberty to apply to the Tribunal if unable to do so</p> <p>See decision for other remedies ordered.</p>
<b>Race</b>				
s. 13	Race; Religion; Place of Origin; Sex	<i>Ens v. 0704121 BC Ltd. dba Gandy HVAC and others (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 277</a>	<p>C was subjected to persistent racist, sexist, and Islamophobic comments by managers, creating a poisoned work environment. C was sexually assaulted by a co-worker outside of work. R's response to the sexual assault was unreasonable and discriminatory; C's supervisor initially ignored her report of the assault, and R took no action at all until C reported the assault to a different manager, three years later.</p>	<p>I2D: \$30,000</p> <p>(post-judgment interest)</p>

			<p>Seven months after reporting the sexual assault a second time, C complained about a colleague's racist comment. C lost her temper at work and behaved unprofessionally. R terminated C. The Tribunal found that the termination was discriminatory. The stress of the sexual assault investigation and the history of racist comments in the workplace contributed to C losing her composure. The R ought to have inquired whether C's conduct was connected to her protected characteristics before terminating her.</p>	
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Place of Origin</b>	<i>Employee v. Company and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 157</a>	<p>C was from Iran. C raised concerns after his supervisor and the president of the Company made comments about a world cup soccer game between Iran and another country. C's supervisor met with C several times asking C to sign a document acknowledging his concerns were oversensitive and agreeing to take steps to better tolerate other's views in the workplace. C felt he did not fit in in the workplace and feared he would lose his job if he did not sign the document. The Tribunal found that the Rs process of engaging the C in various drafts of the document and asking him to sign it was an adverse impact in employment in which his</p>	<p>I2D: \$35,000 (discrimination and retaliation combined)</p> <p>LW: \$26,250  (pre and post-judgement interest on the awards)</p>

			<p>place of origin was a factor. The R's conduct was not justified.</p> <p>After C filed a complaint at the Tribunal, the R fired him. The Tribunal found that the R knew about the complaint and found that the termination was retaliation.</p>	
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Race</b>	<i>Sarba v. Ruskin Construction Ltd. and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 74</a>	<p>C was a Black African Canadian. After being called a racial slur by one of the R co-workers, C got into a fight with him and both were suspended by R employer. The employer did not arrange for C's return to the construction work site after the suspension period. The Tribunal found that R co-workers used racial slurs against C on various occasions, and that R employer terminated C by not arranging for his return, and C's previous complaints about racial harassment were a factor in the termination.</p>	<p>I2D: \$65,000</p> <p>LW: \$71,065.12</p> <p>Expenses: \$1,385.04</p> <p>Within three months, R employer must update workplace harassment policy, then provide education for employees</p>
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Race; Sex</b>	<i>The Applicant v. Independent Investigations Office of British Columbia (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 204</a>	<p>C accepted an offer of employment from R and was required to undergo a polygraph as part of R's security screening protocols. At the polygraph, C expressed concern about the security of her sensitive personal information and the session was ended. On the second attempt, the polygrapher made comments the Tribunal found discriminated against C as a Métis woman. R then rescinded C's offer</p>	<p>I2D: \$15,000</p> <p>LW: \$36,812.48</p> <p>Expenses: \$88</p>

			of employment based on concerns that her correspondence with their office had been rude and adversarial. The Tribunal found that R considered C's conduct based on stereotypes of Indigenous women as demanding, suspicious, and non-compliant, and C's sex and race were factors in R's withdrawal of the offer.	
s. 13	<b>Race; Sex</b>	<i>Young Worker v. Heirloom and another</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 137</a>	C, a 13-year-old Black girl, worked at R restaurant, including at the cash register. R manager accused C of theft after alleged cash shortages. Afterwards, C was moved to a different post, R manager refused to give her a reference letter, and C eventually resigned as she felt uncomfortable working there. Tribunal found that C was singled out by R manager because of her race and sex, and R restaurant failed to provide a discrimination-free work environment.	I2D: \$25,000 LW: \$2,495.77 Expenses: \$366.21
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Mema v. City of Nanaimo (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 91</a>  Judicial review – <i>Nanaimo (City of) v. Mema</i> <a href="#">2025 BCSC 863</a> ; BCHRT decision upheld	C was the Chief Financial Officer at R city. C used his corporate credit card for personal expenses, which was contrary to policy but a common practice at R, and he persistently had issues with repayment. Months after C completed repayments and was reprimanded, and while changes to the credit card policy were underway following an independent	I2D: \$50,000 LW: \$583,413.40 Expenses: \$10,150.04

			audit, one of the R staff filed a misconduct report against C, which resulted in termination of his employment. Tribunal found that the misconduct report was motivated by a broader suspicion of C's character based on racial stereotypes. As R's decision to terminate C primarily relied on the report, Tribunal found that R's decision was also discriminatory.	
s. 13	<b>Race; Religion; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Bhangu v. Inderjit Dhillon and others</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 24</a>	Two Rs used a slur against C that discriminated against him based on his caste during an altercation at a staff party. The Tribunal found that the use of the slur constituted discrimination based on C's protected characteristics and caused C adverse psychological impacts.	I2D: \$6,000  Expenses: \$3,755.81 (including an expert report obtained by C describing the nature of caste-based discrimination)
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Martinez Johnson v. Whitewater Concrete Ltd. and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 129</a>	C was Mayan and Black. His complaint alleged that he was subjected to racial slurs by coworkers, his employer did not properly address the discrimination, and he therefore had to leave his employment. The Tribunal found that a co-worker did make two egregious and virulent slurs. It did not find that other instances of alleged discrimination occurred, nor did it agree that the employer failed to properly address the discrimination.	I2D: \$2,500

s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Religion; Costs</b>	<i>Perry v. Honu Boat Charters and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 68</a>	C was denied employment due to her racial background and spiritual beliefs. On multiple occasions the employer made disparaging comments based on false assumptions founded in anti-Black racism. He also made disparaging comments during the proceeding, which resulted in an award of costs.	I2D: \$1,500 (which was all the C asked for)  Expenses: \$900  Costs: \$1,000
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Retaliation</b>	<i>Francis v. BC Ministry of Justice (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 16</a> (remedy)  <i>Francis v. BC Ministry of Justice (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 136</a> (merits)	C worked at correctional facility. Prior decision of HRT already determined that Rs discriminated against C on the basis of race in nine separate incidents, and that two incidents constituted retaliation.  C was subjected to a poisoned work environment and has been unable to work in any occupation since 2013. In addition, the discrimination caused severe impact on C's mental & physical health, marriage, and social life. Discriminated in overt ways that directly attacked his identity and feelings of self-worth. Given the workplace context, in which C had to be able to depend on coworkers and supervisors for physical safety, he also came to genuinely fear for his own safety while at work.	LW: \$761,542 (\$264,060 for past loss of earnings + \$431,601 for future loss of earnings + \$65,881 for pension loss)  I2D: \$176,000  Expenses: \$1,140  Disbursements: \$25,515.24  (Remedies for discrimination under s. 13 and retaliation under s. 43 combined)
s. 13	<b>Race; Sex; Colour</b>	<i>Eva obo others v. Spruce Hill Resort and another</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 238</a>	Complaint on behalf of 8 Caucasian employees of R, a spa. Complaint dismissed on grounds of ancestry and place of origin. Majority of staff had been laid off due to renovations	I2D: range from \$3,000 to \$18,000 (7 awards)

			<p>and a few, including Cs, remained. R continuously made racially charged comments, and hired staff of Chinese origin to perform Cs' duties. Cs were gradually removed from the schedule and replaced with Chinese employees, and then (with one exception) were fired or resigned. Ms. Eva further alleged sexual harassment - R attempted to share hotel room on business trip.</p> <p>Race, Sex, and Colour complaints justified. Ancestry and Place of Origin complaints dismissed.</p>	LW: range from \$47,561.28 to \$5,151.33 (6 awards)
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Gardner and another v. Geldenhuys</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 150</a>	<p>On at least three occasions, C (Ms. Jurao) was subjected to intimidating, and differential treatment by R on the basis of her place of origin.</p> <p>Another C (Ms. Gardner) was treated in a demeaning, disrespectful and discriminatory manner by R and race and place of origin were central to R's race-based slurs.</p>	I2D: Ms. Jurao \$2,000; Ms. Gardner \$1,500
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin; Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Balikama obo others v. Khaira Enterprises and others</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 107</a>	<p>C, a Tree planter/brusher complained on behalf of numerous other African workers who were not paid for significant amount of work, racially harassed, and made to live in substandard conditions. Many workers suffered familial problems due to lack of pay. One C was sexually harassed</p>	I2D: \$10,000 to each worker plus an additional \$1,000 for each 30 days worked for each worker (length of employment varied)

s. 13	<b>Race; Colour</b>	<i>Stephenson v. Northern Concord Industry and others</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 100</a>	R wanted a white salesperson to stimulate sales in salesroom and phased C, a man of colour, out of the business.	I2D: \$7,000 LW: \$8,000
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin; Family Status</b>	<i>Torres and others v. Langtry Industries (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 3</a>  Judicial Review - <i>Langtry Industries Ltd. v. British Columbia (Human Rights Tribunal)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCSC 1091</a> : Petition dismissed	Cs, the Torres family and Mr. Flores, worked for R. The Torres family had been the target of race-based comments and harassment on the basis of race, family and marital status by R. R was constructively terminated Mr. Flores after he tried to address the discrimination he and his family were experiencing. Remainder of the Torres family was terminated due to their reaction to Mr. Flores' termination.	I2D: Mr. Flores \$4,500; Mr. Torres \$6,000; Ms. Torres \$4,000; Wendy Torres \$3,500  LW: Mr. Flores \$5,132.92; Mr. Torres \$8,327.01; Ms. Torres \$9,306.27; Wendy Torres \$7,078.52
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>C.S.W.U. Local 1611 v. SELI Canada and others (No. 8)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 436</a>	Cs, Latin American workers on the Canada Line tunnel project, were paid less than European workers. Cs were also given inferior accommodation, less choice of food, made to account for reimbursements received instead of receiving a monthly allowance, and worked side by side with European workers being paid double. They also were unable to escape the discriminatory treatment as foreign workers on temporary permits.	I2D: \$10,000 per complainant  LW: difference between the salary of the complainant group and comparator group  Expenses: difference between the amount paid to the complainant group and the comparator group in reimbursement throughout the project
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Asad v. Kinexus Bioinformatics</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 293</a>  Judicial Review -	R's racially profiled C in his employment, subjecting him to suspicion of involvement in terrorist acts including reporting him to the RCMP. R failed to ameliorate	I2D: \$6,000 (would have awarded more but Tribunal was limited by precedent maximum)

		<i>Kinexus Bioinformatics Corporation v. Asad</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCSC 33</a> ; BCHRT decision upheld	conditions of poisoned workplace for C. C suffered from physical ailments due to discrimination.	Expenses: \$599 for cost of expert report  Costs: \$5,000 for improper conduct during hearing
s. 13	Race	<i>Small Legs v. Dhillon</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 104</a>	C confronted R about being paid a minimum wage and R started screaming at her, called her a “stupid fucking Indian”, and to pack her equipment (brushes, scissors and shears) and get the “hell out of the salon” where she worked.	I2D: \$5,000
s. 13	Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin	<i>Dastghib v. Richmond Auto Body and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 197</a>	Auto mechanic C was subject to racial slurs and jokes and terminated. C was terminated due to an incident in which he threw a piece of equipment and yelled at co-workers, but discrimination caused C to be angry and short tempered, causing the outburst.	All remedies, including costs, to be determined between the parties, Tribunal remained seized of the issue and hear submissions if parties are unable to agree
s. 13	Race; Place of Origin; Physical Disability; Mental Disability; Sex; Sexual Orientation	<i>Mercier v. Dasilva</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 72</a>	R made racist and sexist remarks towards C, causing C’s increased absences which in turn led to his termination.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: \$1,600
s. 13	Race; Place of Origin; Sex (Harassment)	<i>Hashimi v. International Crowd Management (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 66</a>	C was called “Fez” and other racial slurs at work, sexually harassed, and bitten on the rear end hard enough to cause significant bruising. R liable for discriminatory conduct of employees and failed to take any remedial steps.	I2D: \$7,000 for sex discrimination; \$3,000 for racial discrimination  No LW as C did not seek an award

s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; or Place of Origin</b>	<i>Pillai v. Lafarge Canada Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 26</a>	C was subject to racial slurs producing a poisoned work environment, even though they were not made directly to him. C experienced brief fear and anxiety and was still shaken by the experience five years after the fact. R was liable for the conduct of its employees (regardless of whether it was aware of the discrimination).	I2D: \$3,000 (C asked for \$10,000, Rs \$1,500-3,500)
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry</b>	<i>Hopkins v. T.T.I.C.L. Computer Corp. et al.</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 8</a>	C, a person of Aboriginal ancestry, was subject to racially derogatory remarks from the vice president of R, creating a hostile work environment. C was deeply disturbed by R's remarks, did not sleep well, and had nightmares and alleged aggravation of medical conditions (although without supporting documentation).	I2D: \$2,500
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin; Religion</b>	<i>Poonja-Jiwany v. Bernard Haldane Associates</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 24</a>	Employee of R called C, another employee, a racial slur. C reported the employee, who was ultimately put in charge of decision to fire C and did so. R terminated C rather than addressing underlying issues or investigating the allegations.	I2D: \$800 (C requested \$3,500)  LW: to be agreed upon by the parties with liberty to apply to the Tribunal if unable to do so
s. 13	<b>Race; Colour; Sex</b>	<i>Collins v. Suleman Meats et al.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 41</a>	Employer consistently used derogatory racialized language against C. She was later terminated after filing a complaint.  The Tribunal dismissed C's complaint under s.13, but found that R's termination of C contravened the Code by retaliation under s. 43.	I2D: \$1,500  LW: \$5,040 (plus pre and post-judgement interest); \$192 to attend the hearing

<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry</b>	<i>Stewart v. Samuels et al.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 18</a>	C was subjected to racist comments by co-workers and was transferred to a different work site that paid less at his request. However, C was not seriously hurt by the racist comments and did not specifically complain about them at the time they were made. C also failed to apply to transfer to high paying jobs after the initial transfer.	I2D: \$1,000  No LW as C willingly accepted a lower paying transfer job, failing to mitigate her losses
<b>Religion</b>				
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<i>Paquette v. Amaruk Wilderness and another (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 35</a>	Rs refused to accept C's application for an internship in part because she had obtained her undergraduate degree from Trinity Western University. Rs harassed C for her presumed religious beliefs.	I2D: \$8,500  Expenses: \$661.08 for accommodation and mileage to attend the hearing  Post-judgement interest
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<i>McGuire v. Better Image Property Maintenance and others</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 544</a>	Rs referred to C as a "nominal Christian" and told her that she was not acting like a true Christian. R also made comments related to her being Jewish.	I2D: \$2,000 & post-judgement interest  LW: \$1,170 & pre-judgement interest
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<i>Derksen v. Myert Corps Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 60</a>	C terminated for taking unauthorized day off for religious purposes.	I2D: \$2,000  LW: \$5,957, tax gross up and interest  Expenses: \$770 to attend the hearing
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Religion</b>	<i>Jones v. C.H.E. Pharmacy Inc. et al</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 1</a>	An employee who had 16 years' service, felt compelled not to continue his employment because	I2D: \$3,500  LW: \$21,243.56 & pre-judgement interest

			the employer chose not to accommodate his religious beliefs.	Vacation pay: \$4,710.40 & pre-judgement interest  Expenses: \$1142 & interest
<b>Gender Identity and Expression; Sexual Orientation</b>				
<b>s. 13 (also s. 7)</b>	<b>Gender Identity and Expression; Sexual Orientation</b>	<i>Chilliwack Teachers' Association v. Neufeld (No. 10)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 49</a>  <i>Chilliwack Teachers' Association v. Neufeld (No. 11)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 50</a>	Cs were LGBTQ teachers. R was a school board trustee. For five years, R publicly denigrated LGBTQ people and teachers and associated them with the worst forms of child abuse. The effect was a discriminatory work environment for Cs. There was a direct connection between R's high-profile rhetoric and a climate in schools that felt unsafe to the Cs and was more permissive of anti-LGBTQ discrimination.	I2D: \$750,000 to be distributed equally among members of the class, resulting in individual awards of between \$4,601.23 to \$16,666.67.  LW: \$442 for one teacher for wages lost in order to attend the hearing  Costs: \$10,000 for improper conduct throughout the Tribunal's process.  (pre and post-judgement interest on I2D)
<b>s.13</b>	<b>Gender Identity and Expression</b>	<i>Nelson v. Goodberry Restaurant Group Ltd. dba Buono Osteria and others</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 137</a>	C is non-binary, gender fluid and transgender. They were misgendered by R and called gendered nicknames like "honey" despite being asked to stop by C.	I2D: \$30,000
<b>s. 13 (also s. 8)</b>	<b>Sex (Gender)</b>	<i>Nixon v. Vancouver Rape Relief Society</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 1</a>	C was not permitted to volunteer with R because she was a transgender woman. C was hurt and	I2D: \$7,500 (overturned on judicial review)

		Judicial Review – <i>Vancouver Rape Relief Society v. Nixon et al.</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCSC 1936</a> : BCHRT decision set aside  Appeal – <i>Vancouver Rape Relief Society v. Nixon</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCCA 601</a> : Appeal of BCSC decision dismissed	humiliated, had a major anxiety attack, and contemplated suicide.	
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>				
<b>s. 13 and s. 10</b>	<b>Sexual orientation; Marital status</b>	<i>Brooks v. Skyacres Turkey Ranch Ltd. and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 73</a>	C worked and lived on a family farm owned by his father. The father and the farm were found jointly liable for the father’s discriminatory comments and conduct in the course of C’s employment and tenancy, in relation to C’s homosexuality and later his marriage as C lived with his husband on the farm.	I2D: \$40,000
<b>Sex (Gender)</b>				
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Sex (Gender)</b>	<i>Spielberger v. Sofo Kitchens Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 1</a>	The Tribunal found that C’s coworkers’ hostile treatment of her constituted discrimination. This included refusal to carry out instructions and negative comments that referred to C being a woman. R employer was found liable for its employees’ discriminatory conduct. The employer’s own conduct,	I2D: \$6,000

			however, was not found to be discriminatory.	
s. 13	<b>Sex (Gender); Marital Status</b>	<i>Loiselle v. Windward Software Inc. (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 80</a>	C alleged a number of incidents from male co-workers were discriminatory and created a poisoned work environment, ultimately resulting in constructive dismissal. C proved discrimination in relation to (1) a male superior slapping her hands in a 'joking' fashion; (2) a male superior giving her a questionnaire based on the '5 Love Languages'; and (3) a male colleague hitting her with his keys, putting her in a headlock and hitting her in the head. The Tribunal found the incidents affected C's ability to participate fully and with dignity in her employment in connection with her identity as a single woman.	I2D: \$15,000
s. 13	<b>Sex (Gender); Retaliation</b>	<i>The Sales Associate v. Aurora Biomed Inc. and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 5</a>	R, CEO of the company, made unwanted comments to C connected to her sex. R called C "beautiful girl" and told her to smile more often. When C raised the issue with her supervisor, there was no response other than to meet with C and R, at which time C was asked to sign a document stating that R did not sexually assault C. The day after that meeting, C was terminated. Tribunal found that R likely did not intend to make C uncomfortable, but it had a degrading impact on C. Tribunal also situated these comments within	I2D: \$20,000  LW: \$3,557.17 (lost wages and lost commission for a sale)  Expenses: \$8.50 (registry searches)  Policy change: detailed directions on developing and implementing a policy change (see steps at para. 200).

			the larger context of gendered hierarchies that persist at work.	Costs: \$1,000 (R repeatedly failed to abide by Tribunal directions regarding disclosure. R then disclosed 64 relevant docs 8 days prior to hearing)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Gender); Family Status</b>	<i>MacDonald v. Najafi and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 13</a>	The incidents were related to the fact that she was a woman. When C was disturbed by R's conduct including whistling, comments about her weight, and the reference to her as "girl" at the barbeque, she objected. R did not set out deliberately to insult or injure C because of her sex, although he does seem to have largely ignored her efforts to communicate to him that she found his actions and comments offensive or demeaning.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: \$5,900  Expenses: \$306.79 for air fare to attend the hearing
s. 13	<b>Sex (Gender)</b>	<i>Morrison v. AdvoCare and others</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 298</a>	C was not hired as care aide due to being male even though he was qualified. C applied and was rejected multiple times.	I2D: \$ 5,000  LW: \$3,150  Expenses: \$3,773 for gas and lodging expenses for new job
s. 13 (also s. 12)	<b>Sex (Gender)</b>	<i>Pennock v. Centre City Drywall (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 333</a>	C paid less than male coworkers contrary to s. 13 of the <i>Code</i> . The complaint involved members of the extended family causing acrimony within resulting in I2D	I2D: \$2,500
s. 13	<b>Sex (Gender)</b>	<i>Kalyn v. Vancouver Island Health Authority (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 377</a>	As a woman in the male-dominated environment of security, C was confronted by barriers to fair and equal opportunity. C was branded a	I2D: \$20,000  LW: unspecified quantum for 26 months plus tax

			trouble maker for raising allegations of sex discrimination and was not informed of the substance or context of complaints when she was risk of termination, while male counterparts were.	gross up, quantum to be determined between the parties. Tribunal to hear arguments and decide the issue if necessary if no agreement reached within 60 days  Order that C be reinstated
s. 13	Sex (Gender)	<i>Van Eijk and Sheppard v. Seacastle Enterprises Inc. (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 363</a>	Cs, two female managers of a Burger King, were fired when Rs bought franchise.	I2D: \$4,000 for one C \$5,000  LW: \$25,138.78 for one C, \$5,963.48 for the other
s. 13	Sex (Gender)	<i>Briggs v. B.C. (Ministry of Water, Land and Air Pollution)</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 17</a>	R only offered C promotions requiring relocation, which it knew she could not do. R should have offered her other promotions under a collective agreement but did not do so. C was a backcountry ranger, a male dominated job. The Tribunal found it was reasonable to infer that gender was a factor in the refusal to promote although no single piece of circumstantial evidence alone was sufficient to support that conclusion. C did not apply to renew job after filing HR complaint. C lost confidence, and suffered injury to dignity because lived in small town and had to explain why she was no longer in uniform.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: \$2,583.44
s. 13	Sex (Gender)	<i>Garand v. K.E. Gostlin Enterprises Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 8</a>	C was not hired for a job despite having equivalent or superior qualifications than the successful candidate and was told she was not	I2D: \$4,000 (overturned on judicial review)

		Judicial Review – Petition allowed in Oral Reasons for judgement, November 13, 2002	picked due to lack of interpersonal skills despite never having been advised of this during her 20 year career with R. C resigned because she felt she would always be a “manager in waiting”, perpetually passed over because of her gender.	LW: unspecified quantum for 1 year of differences in wages between C and successful candidate for the job. (overturned on judicial review)
<b>S. 13</b>	<b>Sex (Gender)</b>	<i>Johnson v. Haverland Installations Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">1998 CanLII 29756</a> (BC HRT)	C, a woman and an electrician, was paid less than a male apprentice with less experience. Her employer then laid her off and told her there was no work, but hired a new male worker during this period.	I2D: \$2,000  LW: \$2,872 (difference in pay between her and male apprentice plus 16 weeks of lost wages)
<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>				
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Sex (Harassment); Race; Religion; Place of Origin.</b>	<i>Ens v. 0704121 BC Ltd. dba Gandy HVAC and others (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 277</a>	C was subjected to persistent racist, sexist, and Islamophobic comments by managers, creating a poisoned work environment. C was sexually assaulted by a co-worker outside of work. R’s response to the sexual assault was unreasonable and discriminatory; C’s supervisor initially ignored her report of the assault, and R took no action at all until C reported the assault to a different manager, three years later.  Seven months after reporting the sexual assault a second time, C lost her temper at work and behaved unprofessionally. R terminated C. The Tribunal found that the termination was discriminatory. The stress of the sexual assault investigation and the history of racist	I2D: \$30,000  (post-judgment interest)

			<p>comments in the workplace contributed to C losing her composure. The R ought to have inquired whether C's conduct was connected to her protected characteristics before terminating her.</p>	
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<p><i>Mohr v. Power Flagging and Traffic Control (Power Earth) and another (No. 3)</i>, <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 40</a></p>	<p>C alleged that she was sexually assaulted and harassed by a co-worker. C reported the alleged harassment to R. R did not investigate C's complaint. R terminated C's employment.</p> <p>The Tribunal found that C had not proven that the assault and harassment took place. However, the Tribunal also found that C's complaint to R about the harassment was a factor in R's decision to terminate her employment. Therefore, the termination was discriminatory.</p>	<p>I2D: \$17,000 (post-judgment interest)</p>
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<p><i>Knowles v. Ontime Moving Corporation</i>, <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 183</a></p>	<p>C was bullied and sexually harassed by a co-worker. The harassment included sexual innuendos, inappropriate touching, derogatory language, and the co-worker lowering his pants. C told employer R about her co-worker's conduct and R failed to effectively address it. C no longer felt safe coming to work and quit her job.</p>	<p>I2D: \$35,000 LW: \$29,591.51 Expenses: \$39.16 (prejudgment interest on wage loss and expenses, post judgment interest on all awards)</p>

s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment); Disability</b>	<i>Ms. L v. Clear Pacific Holdings Ltd. and others</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 14</a>	During the course of C's two-year employment as a personal assistant, her male employer continuously subjected her to sexual comments, unwanted touching, humiliation, and manipulation. R enabled and exploited C's dependency on cocaine to maintain control over her. R withheld wages from C. On one occasion, R physically assaulted C, resulting in physical and mental injuries, and abandoned her in a foreign country.	I2D: \$100,000 LW: \$61,541.90 Expenses: \$8,699.84 (medical expenses due to the discrimination)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Curken v. Gastronome Enterprises</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 2</a>	C experienced sexual harassment from a co-worker in the course of employment. This was not known by the employer at the time. The Tribunal found the employer liable for the co-worker's conduct despite its lack of knowledge, and for its failure to ensure a workplace free of discrimination.	I2D: \$25,000 Expenses: \$75 (hearing costs: photocopying, parking and couriers)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment); Mental Disability</b>	<i>Billow v. Hardy Yardcare and another</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 98</a>	At work, C was subject to sexual harassment and discriminatory comments relating to her sex and mental disability. She was treated differently than male employees by, for example, being given housekeeping tasks that male employees were not required to do.	I2D: \$15,000
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment); Retaliation</b>	<i>Ms. K v. Deep Creek Store and another</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 158</a>	C's boss sexually harassed her, then retaliated against her after she filed a human rights complaint. C was 21 years old and worked at a convenience store where she was sexually harassed by a male boss.	I2D: \$45,000 LW: \$53,903.20

			When C attempted to resist the harassment, R created a hostile work environment. After filing the human rights complaint, C was fired, and R trespassed at her home in the middle of the night.	
s. 13	Sex	<i>Ban v. MacMillan</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 74</a>	C worked on a cruise ship, and R was his direct supervisor. R snuck into C's room while he was asleep and sexually assaulted him. C developed PTSD and was unable to work for four months, and eventually left the company. R failed to appear in two pre-conference hearings as well as the hearing.	I2D: \$25,000  Lost Wages: \$8,333
s. 13	Sex (Harassment)	<i>Basic v. Esquimalt Denture Clinic and another</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 138</a>	C worked as a receptionist in R's denture clinic. The R touched her in a sexual way on numerous occasions, and made sexualized comments about her body and appearance. She repeatedly told him to stop. R's wife terminated C's employment. R argued the interactions were consensual, and that C sexualized the workplace through her dress and behaviour. He argued she was terminated for non-discriminatory reasons. The Tribunal rejected these arguments. The R relied on impermissible rape myths and gender stereotypes.	I2D: \$25,000  LW: \$11,796.04 (wage loss and wage differential)  Expenses: \$1612 (costs of attending hearing, witness travel, preparation of documents)
s. 13	Sex (Harassment)	<i>MP v. JS</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 131</a>	C, who was employed as a cleaner in R's home, alleged that R sexually assaulted her in the course of her duties. R argued that C had previously consented to sexual	I2D: \$40,000  LW: \$4,300

			activity with him in exchange for money. The Tribunal found discrimination given that R's sexual conduct was unwelcome and C felt unable to continue in her employment due to his actions.	Expenses: \$49.98 (medication); \$106.50 (parking at hearing)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>LL v. DM and another</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 129</a>	C was hired and began a sexual relationship with owner R. R would withhold work from C or bar C from the jobsite when feeling jealous of C's other relationships. After the complaint was filed, R publicized a pornographic video featuring C. Tribunal found C's sex was a factor in the adverse employment-related consequences imposed on C by R for issues arising from their personal, consensual relationship. The Tribunal also found that R's publication of the video was retaliation for filing the complaint.	I2D: \$15,000 (incl post-judgment interest)  LW: \$640  Retaliation: \$7,500
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Araniva v. RSY Contracting and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 97</a>	R sexually harassed C in the workplace. C's hours were reduced when C refused to accept or tolerate R's sexual advances. C eventually left job due to harassment.	I2D: \$40,000* (*upward trend for these damages noted in decision)  LW: \$8000  Expenses: \$4,336 for counselling and expert report. Cost of doctor's in-person testimony (TBD)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment); Family</b>	<i>PN v. FR and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 60</a>	C was a Filipino nanny working for R. C was sexually assaulted and her vulnerability (living and working	I2D: \$50,000  LW: \$5,866

	<b>Status; Race; Ancestry; Place of Origin; Retaliation</b>		in Canada with no support system) was exploited. Suit filed against C by R was deemed retaliation.	
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Paananen v. Scheller (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 257</a>	C worked at a pizza restaurant where she was sexually harassed and assaulted by a supervisor. There was a power imbalance and also a considerable age difference - C was 16.	I2D: \$3,000 LW: \$300
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Root v. Ray Ray's Beach Club and others</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 143</a>	C was sexually harassed at work - the harassment was in the form of three painful, unwelcome, intimate blows to the butt. They were sexual in nature, and R knew, or ought to have known, they were unwelcome. They negatively affected C's work environment, eventually led to reduced work hours and ultimately her dismissal, for no stated reason.	I2D: \$5,000 with post-judgement interest until paid in full
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment); Retaliation</b>	<i>Q v. Wild Log Homes and another</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 135</a>	R made sexual comments and sexually touched C on numerous occasions and sued her in BCSC for cost with respect to HR complaint (retaliation).	I2D: \$7,500 (Sex) I2D: \$8,000 (Retaliation) Post judgement interest Costs: \$6,500 against R for improper conduct during Hearing
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Young and Young on behalf of Young v. Petres</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 38</a>	R, employer, frequently hugged young female staff members in attempt to cleanse the workplace of negative energy.	I2D: Algebra Young \$4,000; Aja Young \$6,000
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>McIntosh v. Metro Aluminum Products and another</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 34</a>	C was subjected to ongoing sexual harassment through unwanted text messages from R.	I2D: \$12,500 LW: \$14,493

		Judicial Review – <i>McIntosh v. Metro Aluminum Products Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCSC 345</a> ; BCHRT decision upheld		Pre and post judgement interest  Expenses: \$2,900.85 for cost of forensic report and reimbursement for WorkSafe BC benefits lost as a result of attending the hearing
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Soroka v. Dave's Custom Metal Works and others</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 239</a>	C was consistently sexually harassed by co-worker.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$2,900  Pre judgement interest on LW & post judgement interest on I2D  See interesting remedies re counselling for employees and removal of pornography.
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Tyler v. Robnik and Mobility World (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 192</a>	R (manager) asked C (employee) to come to his hotel room, offered her his hotel key, and touched her on the leg.	I2D: \$6,500
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Ratzlaff v. Marpaul Construction and another</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 13</a>	C experienced unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature which detrimentally affected her work environment and led to her resignation from her employment. The conduct in question was continual and both verbal and physical. Large award due to significant physical nature of the	I2D: \$25,000  LW: \$22,000  Post-judgement interest until paid in full.

			harassment - physical assault then attempted rape.	
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Kwan v. Marzara and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 418</a>	R harassed C by hugging and kissing her at work on four occasions shortly after hiring her, inviting her to meet with him outside the workplace. Significant disparity in age and C was seeking first professional employment outside a restaurant environment. C required counselling.	I2D: \$6,000 (C asked for \$6,000)  LW: \$1,120 (full wage loss even though C did not immediately look for work in reaction to what R did) Pre-judgment interest on the wage loss of \$1,12; post-judgment interest, running on the wage loss of \$1,120 and I2D
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Harrison v. Nixon Safety Consulting and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 462</a>	Mr. Ford sexually harassed C in the course of her employment at the Lofts. Mr. Goodman, Con-Forte's representative failed to deal with the harassment when he learned of it. NSC, at the indirect urging of Navigator, terminated her employment soon after she complained about the harassment.	I2D: \$15,000  LW: \$14,000  Costs: \$3,000 for late R disclosure  Pre-judgment interest on LW; Post-judgment interest on expenses, I2D and costs.
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>J.J. v. School District No. 43 (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 360</a>  Judicial Review – <i>J.J. v. School District No. 43 (Coquitlam)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCSC 523</a> ; Tribunal directed to reconsider	C was sexually harassed by a co-worker. She complained to her supervisor. After she complained, the terms and conditions of her employment were changed, resulting in her not being re-hired. She alleged that this was effective termination of her employment and	I2D: \$4,000  LW: unspecified quantum for eight days at 100% of wages, plus five months at 50% of wages - reduced once compensation became tied to loss of employment opportunity,

		<p>decision on quantum of damages and reinstatement</p> <p>Appeal – <i>J.J. v. School District 43 (Coquitlam)</i>, <a href="#">2013 BCCA 67</a>: Appeal allowed, Tribunal decision restored</p>	done to punish her for the complaints she had made.	<p>which is only partial compensable</p> <p>Expenses: \$491.37 to attend the hearing</p> <p>Pre-judgement interest on LW &amp; expenses and post-judgement interest on I2D</p>
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Behm v. 6-4-1 Holdings and others</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 286</a>	C worked for R and alleged four incidents of sexual harassment by a co-worker: a comment; a shared article; a request for a hug; and sexual touching. HRT decided that all but the article constituted harassment.	<p>I2D: \$5,000</p> <p>LW: \$393.75 for two weeks of wages</p>
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Kwan v. Marzara and another</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 387</a>	C started at new job and boss hugged and kissed her to welcome her, made several comments re having relationship despite having boyfriend. C told R repeatedly she felt uncomfortable with his conduct.	<p>I2D: \$5,000</p> <p>LW: \$1,120</p> <p>Pre and post-judgement interest</p> <p>See second hearing: <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 418</a></p>
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment); Retaliation</b>	<i>Clarke v. Frenchies Montreal Smoked Meats and Blais (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 153</a>	<p>C refused R's inappropriate request that she sit on his lap, suggesting that he get his wife to do so. Tribunal Member suggested that her response to his suggestion was likely to be embarrassing to C. She was terminated days later.</p> <p>Retaliation – R visited C at her new place of work to intimidate her.</p>	<p>I2D: \$4,000 for sexual harassment (would have awarded more if C had asked for more)</p> <p>I2D: \$7,500 for retaliation</p> <p>LW: \$228.80</p> <p>loss of tips: \$90</p>

				Pre and post-judgement interest on LW Post-judgement interest on I2D
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Koblensky v. Westwood and Schwab (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 281</a>	C was subjected to ongoing sexually explicit language and behaviour by a co-worker. C reported this to R, her employer. No action taken. After 4 <sup>th</sup> complaint to R, C was terminated.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: \$144 Post-judgement interest
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Algor v. Alcan Inc. and others</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 200</a>	Employer failed to provide a workplace free from sex discrimination.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: unspecified quantum to be calculated at 60% of wages for a period, then 15% - reductions due to concurrent medical issues also causing absence from work. Quantum to be determined between the parties, Tribunal to remain seized of the issue for 30 days to receive written submissions and decide the issue if necessary  Expenses: benefits C would have had covered by R's employee benefits plan; Post-judgement interest on LW
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Mottu v. MacLeod and others</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 76</a>	C refused to wear a bikini top at nightclub R's event and was relegated to "degrading and inferior job" with fewer hours on subsequent	I2D: \$3,000  LW: \$2,917.97

			shifts. Ultimately was forced to resign. C's doctor advised her to take medical leave from working for R.	Post-judgement interest on LW
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Gill v. Grammy's Place Restaurant and Bakery Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 88</a>	Ongoing sexual harassment in form of "attack" and sexual comments and failure to prevent customers touching – later fired for not acquiescing.	I2D: \$10,000 LW: \$7,500 Medical expenses \$749.34 - 50% of medical expenses for treatment of conditions pre-existing but exacerbated by the discrimination.  Expenses: \$1,527.96 for cost of a transcript for a portion of a witness' evidence at the hearing following a break in the evidence  Post-judgement interest
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Twohey v. Bartman et al. (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 83</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Bartman v. Twohey et al.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCSC 1211</a> : BCHRT decision upheld	R harassed C, mostly verbally (but on one occasion physically). C became tense and anxious, had difficulty sleeping and eating.	I2D: \$4,000 (C asked for \$10,000, R suggested \$1,500-2,500)  LW: \$7,291.66
<b>s. 13</b>	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Fougere v. Rallis and Kalamata Greek Taverna</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 23</a>	C was a waitress who was sexually harassed at work. C complained and was subsequently terminated.	I2D: \$1,200 LW: \$847.50

				Costs: to be determined (quantum assessed in <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 56</a> )
s.13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Newman v. Gujral</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 16</a>	Employee taken out for dinner by boss who touched her breast, tried to hold her hand and asked for a kiss.	I2D: \$3,500 LW: \$4,000
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Jacob v. Reed and Mingles Holdings Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 37</a>	Manager R kissed and made sexual advances towards C, reduced her hours and ultimately terminated her after she refused them. C was financially vulnerable. R had a position of authority, made repeated advances, and caused a poisoned workplace.	I2D: \$4,000 LW: \$37,272.24 (included an expected but not actually given raise as well as pre-judgement interest)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Smith v. Zenith Security</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 25</a>	Rs discussed who was going to sleep with C first, made other sexual comments and entered C's hotel room bed naked. C was eventually removed from contract, causing negative effect on self-esteem.	I2D: \$3,000 LW: \$10,838
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Huhn v. Joey's Only Seafood Restaurant</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 18</a>	R harassed C, C wrote and posted complaints, R took them down. R eventually yelled and threw a frying pan at C telling her to quit, she did. Sexual conduct may have been welcome at one point but ultimately became unwelcome.	I2D: \$900 (C asked for \$3,500- \$4,500) LW: No award due to C's failure to mitigate
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>LeBlanc v. Dan's Hardware et al.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 32</a>	C was subject to sexual comments and conversations, touching, by manager R. harassment had negative psychological impact on C, undermined dignity and self-respect, was harassed verbally and physically.	I2D: \$3,500 (C asked for \$5,000) LW: \$6,268.60 reduced due to C's failure to mitigate

				Post-judgement interest on LW
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Simon v. Paul Simpson and Med Grill Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 24</a>	C told if she wanted to be part of the management team she had to strip in front of coworkers, resigned rather than seeing those coworkers again.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$16,084.62 - reduced due to C's failure to mitigate
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Willis v. Blencoe</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 12</a>  Judicial Review – <a href="#">B.C.S.C.Victoria Registry No. 97-4616</a> : Petition dismissed, Tribunal decision upheld	C made allegations of sexual harassment against government minister for department at which she was employed. Resulted in her resigning. The Tribunal found discrimination and noted the power imbalance between the parties and C's resultant vulnerability.	I2D: \$5,000  Expenses: \$438.59 for air fare, hotel accommodation for a witness to attend the hearing, and meal expenses
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Hayward v. Gary Stinka &amp; Moxies Restaurant</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 9</a>	C worked as hostess, server, and bartender at restaurant. Resigned due to sexual harassment from owner, R1. C had discussed allegations with managerial staff but nothing done.	I2D: \$5,000
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Varga v. Bentley's Sandwich Heaven</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 8</a>	C was employed for a short time by R, whom she alleged sexually harassed her. R did not appear at hearing.	I2D: \$4,500  LW: \$2,860
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Kayle v. T &amp; V Enterprises Ltd. operating as The Civic Hotel and George Jackson</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 57</a>	C was a singer/entertainer C harassed by manager on stage. C suffered loss of self-confidence but other factors were partially responsible for damages (challenge of the show itself, termination).	I2D: \$1,800 (Range: \$1,000-4,000)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Fiebelkorn v. Poly-Con Industries Ltd. and Cowderoy</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 54</a>	C, a bottle packer, was subject of sexual/sexist jokes, comments, and advances by manager. C was disgusted, shocked, and offended	I2D: \$1,800 (C asked for \$4000-5000)

			by this conduct, but able to return to work immediately.	LW: \$1,920 for 6 weeks of wages – reduced due to C's failure to mitigate
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Tannis et al. v. Calvary Publishing Corp. and Robbins</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 47</a>	R made persistent sexual comments and advances towards Cs (ages 16-21). One C quit due to harassment, others were laid off due to reaction to harassment. <i>Torres</i> factors considered. Cs humiliated, suffered headaches and other physical effects	I2D: \$4,500 for 3 Cs, \$5,000 for one C (all asked for \$3,500-\$4,500)  LW: \$5,850, \$2,500, and \$1,600  Interest on all amounts
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Ryane v. Krieger and Microzip Data</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 41</a>	R, in a position of authority, made persistent sexual advances and comments to C. C was later terminated partially due to harassment. However R and C had a friendly relationship for much of the period of harassment. <i>Torres</i> factors considered.	I2D: \$4,000 (compensating for a "moderate" injury to dignity)  LW: \$9,000
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Mahmoodi v. University of British Columbia and Dutton</i> , <a href="#">1999 BCHRT 56</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Dr. Dutton v. BC Human Rights Tribunal et al.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCSC 1256</a> : BCHRT decision upheld;	C was physically and sexually harassed by her professor at UBC.	I2D: \$4,000  Expenses: \$5,200 for counselling  LW: \$3,200 Pre-judgement interest on LW  Expenses: for costs related to audio expert, tuition and books
s. 13	<b>Sex (Harassment)</b>	<i>Lanteigne v. Sam's Sports Bar Ltd. d.b.a. GG's Sports Bar</i> , <a href="#">1998 BCHRT 39</a>	C's breasts grabbed by customer while at working as a waitress. R did not do anything.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: \$2,385

				Respondent to develop and post a sexual harassment policy to cover the conduct of patrons and employees
<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>				
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Chen v. Casa Health</i> , <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 251</a>	C went on maternity leave. R terminated C while she was still on leave, saying it had eliminated her position. However, the program C had worked for continued to run with the employee who had covered her leave continuing in C's position. The employee who took over C's position was less experienced and made less money than C. The Tribunal found that C's maternity leave was a factor in her termination.	I2D: \$12,000  LW: \$88,166.53 plus an amount to be verified on C's tax records to compensate her for the tax consequences of receiving a lump sum payment of wages.  (prejudgment interest on wage loss, post-judgment interest on both awards)
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Lall v. Apidel Staffing Inc. operating as Apidel Technologies and another</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 45</a>	R terminated C a few weeks after learning she was pregnant. R argued that C's poor work performance and failure to apply for a work-related visa were the reasons for termination, but the Tribunal held that these were not sufficient non-discriminatory explanations and her pregnancy was at least a factor.	I2D: \$7,500  LW: \$12,720
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy); Family Status</b>	<i>LaFleche v. NLFD Auto dba Prince George Ford (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 88</a>	C was not given her job back when she returned from maternity leave as her employer had hired someone else. C was instead given an undefined role that never materialized. Tribunal found that C	I2D: \$12,000  LW: \$66,625 (plus tax gross up and pre- and post-judgment interest)

			was constructively dismissed and her maternity leave was a factor in the dismissal.	
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Weihls v. Great Clips and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 125</a>	R terminated C's employment at a hair salon 8 days after C announced pregnancy. The Tribunal found pregnancy was a factor in C's termination.	I2D: \$9000  LW: \$1,109.16 (plus 4% vacation pay) and \$426.30 in lost tips.  Expenses: \$281.82 for notarizing/couriering documents.  Pre-judgment interest on LW, and post-judgment interest on LW, I2D, and expenses.
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy); Physical Disability</b>	<i>Hill v. Best Western and another</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 92</a>	R failed to find other work for C and laid her off when she was unable to clean hotel bathrooms due to sensitivity to the cleaning products arising from her pregnancy.	I2D: \$2,500  LW: \$1,960
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Lipp v. Maverick's Sports Lounge</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 199</a>	Owner indicated to General Manager, that C was pregnant, and this did not fit the image he wanted for the business, and he wanted her hours reduced so she would quit.	I2D: \$7,500  LW: \$2,000
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Meldrum v. Astro Ventures</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 144</a>	C's shifts were arbitrarily and drastically reduced, and the Tribunal found that her pregnancy was "the" reason for the reduction. C left work and advised R that she considered herself constructively dismissed, which was also found by the Tribunal.	No LW as C went on maternity leave – If she stayed, she would have been terminated after the birth for failure to do BFOR  I2D: \$15,000

s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>LaCouvee v. Alchemy Studios and another</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 126</a>	C became pregnant and asked for changes to her work schedule. Instead, she was terminated so she could “concentrate on baby”. The Tribunal found that Rs became fed up with C’s requests for schedule changes.	I2D: \$7,500 LW: \$3,174 Loss of EI Maternity benefit eligibility: \$3,637
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Dhillon v. Planet Group</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 83</a>	C became pregnant while employed. R became frustrated with her work performance and terminated her. The Tribunal found that her pregnancy was at least a factor in her termination. R did not lead evidence on BFOR.	I2D: \$6,000 LW: \$3,000
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>McFarlane v. Brown (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 424</a>	C became pregnant and informed R. R immediately told C that she did not need her for a few days, became cold, and terminated C while simultaneously posting an online ad to hire her replacement.	I2D: not specified, deferred pending further submissions on remedy (subsequently fixed at \$7,500 - see <i>McFarlane v. Brown (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 119</a> ) LW: \$4,000
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Kooner-Rilcof v. BNA Smart Payment Systems and another</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 263</a>	Rs terminated C’s employment upon learning of her pregnancy, and were unable to provide a non-discriminatory explanation.	I2D: \$8,000 LW: \$3,125
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Mann v. JACE Holdings</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 234</a>	C was dismissed in part because R had learned that she would be going lengthy maternity and parental leave. As she was a short-service employee, the easy solution was simply to let her go.	I2D: \$6,000 LW: \$6,037

s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Su v. Coniston Products</i> (No. 2), <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 223</a>	C was not allowed to return to work after maternity leave. R kept her replacement on instead.	I2D: \$6,500 LW: \$9,000
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Hanson v. U Lounge Hospitality</i> (No. 2), <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 181</a>	C's hours were cut back as restaurant manager once R found out she was pregnant. R decreased C's responsibilities and relied on other workers instead to proactively prepare for C's departure.	I2D: \$6,000 LW: \$5,700
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Sutton v. Best Western Tower Inn</i> (No. 2), <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 314</a>	C's pregnancy-related complications were a factor in R deciding that she was not reliable. This resulted in R terminating C's employment.	I2D: \$2,500 LW: \$4,000
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy); Family Status	<i>Brown v. PML and Wightman</i> (No. 4), <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 93</a>	Rs discriminated against C on the grounds of pregnancy by way of reacting angrily to her pregnancy, failing to advise her of workplace performance concerns in a timely manner, acting in a hostile and humiliating manner, refusing to allow her to bank her work hours, excluding her from consultation on the development of a new sales structure, and demoting her to a lesser earning job without telling her (C discovered this by reading R's website). R also discriminated on the grounds of family status by cancelling C's flexible working conditions. Costs awarded against R for improper conduct including misleading and untruthful statements in testimony or in affidavits.	I2D: \$10,000  Costs: \$10,000 for improper conduct  Expenses: for witness \$5,656.34 awarded in <i>Brown v. PML and Wightman</i> (No. 5), <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 323</a>

s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>de Lisser v. Traveland Leisure Vehicles and others</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 36</a>	C worked part time and wanted to fill in for a maternity leave. When she became pregnant, she was denied the position because she would not be available to fill the entirety of the co-worker's leave.	I2D: \$5000 LW: \$8,000 Loss of EI Maternity benefit eligibility: \$12,000 Tax Gross Up
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Ballendine v. Willoughby and others (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 33</a>	C waitress had employment terminated shortly after disclosing pregnancy. When C asked R why she was being terminated, she was told to ask the father of her unborn children, a customer of the pub.	I2D: \$7,500 LW: and loss of EI Maternity benefit eligibility: \$13,000
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Johnston v. Poloskey and Poloskey</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 55</a>	C disclosed her pregnancy to her employer and subsequently ceased to be called into work. R made a disapproving comment about C being pregnant and unmarried, an attitude the Tribunal found was a factor in C's termination.	I2D: \$2,000 WL \$224
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Stackhouse v. Stack Trucking and Craft (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 161</a>	C was approximately three and a half months pregnant when she told R that her doctor had advised her to limit her work day to 10 hours. After the second day that she attempted to do so, her employment was terminated.	I2D: \$5,000 LW: \$12,000 Reduced EI Maternity benefit eligibility: \$6,608
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>McIntosh v. Shami and Zeeba Hair and Body Image</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 527</a>	C, a hairdresser, was terminated in part because of her pregnancy, as her manager felt she was not up to the job. Rs also removed chairs that C could sit in on her break, instead telling her to leave the salon to find a place to sit.	I2D: \$3,000 LW: \$2,142.99

s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Dance v. ANZA Travel and Boshell (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 196</a>	C was demoted after informing supervisors of her intention to take maternity leave. She was later told she would be laid off if she did not take maternity leave early.	I2D: \$2,500  LW: \$2,911 plus bonus and interest
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Crockett v. Goodman and Eclipps Hair Cafe</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 471</a>	C was hair stylist who required accommodations due to pregnancy. C alleged she was harassed by Rs to the point that she was forced to quit her employment.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: \$8,605
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Peach v. Portal Retail Group</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 316</a>	C was terminated while on maternity leave following a change in corporate owner/operator of the business. R altered hiring process to eliminate C from contention for the job.	I2D: \$2,500  LW: \$1,366 for wage differential  Expenses: \$20 for corporate searches
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Parry v. Vanwest College</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 310</a>	C worked for a private ESL school, went on maternity leave, and was replaced. Shortly before intending to return to work, C was told her position was “closed” due to R’s financial problems, and that she was terminated.	I2D: \$5,000  LW: \$11,842.42  Expenses: of attending hearing \$441  Expenses: \$500 for legal expenses incurred as a result of the contravention
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Dorvault v. Ital Décor and Tinucci</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 148</a>	C applied for a front-end office position with R but was passed over due to pregnancy.	I2D: \$2,500  LW: \$2,839
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Descoteau v. Pare and Wakeside Restaurant</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 19</a>	R retracted letter of reference after complaint filed.	I2D: \$5,500 for both discrimination and retaliation  LW: \$6,000

				EI Benefits: \$2,760 Post-judgement interest of LW and EI benefits until paid in full.
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Young v. 633785 B.C. Ltd. dba Clean House and Matthews</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 135</a>	C, a pregnant woman, worked as a cleaner. She was let go because R believed it could be liable for injury to C's child.	I2D: \$4,000  LW: \$8,160
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Sauve v. 538185 B. C. Ltd. operating as Capone's Restaurant &amp; Live Jazz</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 42</a>	C started a job working in promotions and serving. After revealing she was pregnant her shifts were reduced and she was passed over for opportunities, and was eventually terminated.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: \$8,452  Costs: \$500  Expenses incurred from to having to take early Maternity leave
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Yap v. The Brick Warehouse Corp.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 22</a>	R terminated C rather than accommodate effects of pregnancy.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: 15 weeks  Order that R pay shortfall in C's income due to loss of benefits
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Clouatre v. Takhar and Kahala Enterprises Ltd.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 15</a>	C revealed she was pregnant and as a result lost shifts as a waitress. She was later fired.	I2D: \$3,000  LW: \$7,140  Loss of EI Maternity benefit eligibility: \$3,300
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Patterson v. Seggie</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 2</a>	R terminated C rather than accommodate effects of pregnancy at the restaurant.	I2D: \$2,000

s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Child v. Culpepper's Restaurant</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 3</a>	C lost shifts because of her maternity leave. R failed to return her to work.	I2D: \$3,000 LW: \$7,577.36 (C asked for \$56,047.96)
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Wust v. Lai's Chinese Restaurant (1990) Ltd., doing business as TJ's Chinese Restaurant</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 36</a>	Manager R required C produce a doctor's note saying it was safe for her to continue working. R told C she would have to quit/leave the job at the end of the month even though C intended to work for another 6 months.	I2D: \$1,500 (C asked for \$4,000) LW: \$6,097 Loss of EI Maternity benefit eligibility \$2,098
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Sidhu v. Broadway Gallery</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 9</a>	C worked at a nursery, was fired after providing limitations from doctor due to pregnancy.	I2D: \$3,000 (C asked for \$4,000) LW: \$5,360
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy); Physical Disability	<i>Luschnat v. Kotyk</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 4</a>	C tried to return to work following a pregnancy related illness but had her hours cut and was told she could not sit on shift. C felt punished, was shocked, and had just bought a house with her husband based on both of their earning income.	I2D: \$2,500
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Vestad v. Seashell Ventures Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 38</a>	C alleged employer discriminated against her due to sex (pregnancy), causing her to resign. The Tribunal found discrimination – R had referred to C's pregnancy numerous times during training and terms of C's employment were changed around the same time as R learned of pregnancy.	I2D: \$4,500 LW: \$15,480 & pre and post-judgement interest Expenses: \$428 for cost to have a witness attend the hearing
s. 13	Sex (Pregnancy)	<i>Gareau v. Sandpiper Pub et al.</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 11</a>	R requested C work as a bartender rather than server after learning she	I2D: \$1,250

		Judicial Review – Petition dismissed in Oral Reasons for judgement, November 13, 2002	was pregnant. She refused to sign a waiver of liability and her schedule was changed.	
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Tilsley v. Subway Sandwiches &amp; Salads</i> , <a href="#">2001 BCHRT 2</a>	C found she was pregnant and was told by her supervisor she would not be capable of working through pregnancy. C was told to quit or else Subway would make future employment difficult. C missed a shift on her doctor's recommendation and later suffered a miscarriage. C was fired whilst in hospital. The Tribunal found discrimination.	I2D: \$3,500
s. 13	<b>Sex (Pregnancy)</b>	<i>Skytte v. Danroth</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 61</a>  Judicial Review – <i>C.N. Danroth Contracting Ltd. V. Skytte</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCSC 1227</a> : BCHRT decision upheld	C was a First Aid attendant/cook logging camp who was fired because of pregnancy. C was angered and upset, and suffered a financial impact straining family relationships.	I2D: \$2,500 (comparable cases range \$1500-\$5000)  LW: \$3,627 for one month of wages  Expenses: \$217 to attend the hearing
<b>s. 14 – Unions and Associations</b>				
<b>Mental Disability</b>				
s. 14	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British Columbia (No. 11)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 275</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British</i>	Reopening of <i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British Columbia (No. 9)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 185</a> - EI benefits in the amount of \$2,272 found to have been improperly deducted from the wage loss award. Additional LW in the amount of \$2,272 ordered	LW: \$2,272  Costs: \$3,000 against C for improper conduct

		<p><i>Columbia</i>, <a href="#">2013 BCSC 1325</a>: BCHRT decision upheld with exception of issue regarding employment insurance benefits deducted from award</p> <p>Appeal – <i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British Columbia</i>, <a href="#">2014 BCCA 396</a>: appeal of BCSC decision dismissed</p> <p>See also <i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British Columbia</i>, <a href="#">2013 BCSC 2088</a> – application to re-open in which R was ordered to pay an additional \$283.52 (correcting a previous calculation error)</p>		
<b>s. 14</b>	<b>Mental Disability</b>	<p><i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British Columbia (No. 9)</i>, <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 185</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British Columbia</i>, <a href="#">2013 BCSC 1325</a>: BCHRT decision upheld with exception of issue regarding</p>	C, a lawyer, was denied entry to Law Society due to his mental disability.	<p>I2D: \$25,000</p> <p>LW: \$42,993 for ten month delay in call to the Bar; \$26,810.24 for lost wages in the post-call period; \$2,696.67 for lost wages arising from attendance at hearing on liability Tax gross up</p>

		employment insurance benefits deducted from award  Appeal – <i>Gichuru v. The Law Society of British Columbia</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCCA 396</a> : appeal of BCSC decision dismissed		Expenses: \$600 for legal representation before R's committee; \$1,750 for cost of independent psychiatric examination; \$805.37 for expert report  Pre and post-judgement interest; see decision for details
<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>				
<b>s. 14 (also s. 8)</b>	<b>Race; Colour; Ancestry; Place of Origin</b>	<i>Brar and others v. B.C. Veterinary Medical Association and Osborne (No. 22)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 151</a>	Racial stereotypes played a role in R's dealings with Cs including an English language standard that was higher than necessary and selection of Cs' facilities for unscheduled inspections.  (Tribunal dismissed the s.7 complaint)	I2D: \$35,000, \$15,000, \$10,000, \$7,500, \$30,000, \$10,000, \$10,000, \$2,000, \$5,000, \$25,000, \$10,000, \$30,000 for various Cs  LW: \$1,138.46 for to attend the hearing calculated for four days of testimony and \$39,505 for lost wages due to delay in licensing C, both awarded to Dr. Joshi only
<b>s. 37(4) – Costs</b>				
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Aolick v. A1 Convenience Store and others (No.2)</i> , 2026 BCHRT 62	-Rs failed to disclose relevant documents after multiple requests from Kayla's counsel. C had to apply for disclosure of the documents, and the Tribunal had to use its resources to order the disclosure. Rs still did not disclose some relevant documents.	\$500 against R

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rs filed their Forms 9.3 and 9.6 – late and did not file their Form 9.7</li> <li>- Rs made a baseless application for document disclosure after C had already provided the documents sought</li> <li>- In an email to the Tribunal and C’s counsel, R made serious and unfounded allegations against C’s counsel.</li> <li>-On the second day of hearing, R’s agent was 3 hours late.</li> </ul>	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Chilliwack Teachers’ Association v. Neufeld (No. 11)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 50</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-R surreptitiously recorded two pre-hearing conferences and published one of the recordings.</li> <li>- R published privileged information about settlement discussions, in violation of settlement privilege, the <i>Code</i>, and the Tribunal’s Rules.</li> <li>- R failed to delete a PHC recording, shared it with a third party, and allowed it to be uploaded to the internet, in violation of a Tribunal Order.</li> <li>- R shared confidential information obtained through the Tribunal’s disclosure process, in violation of the implied undertaking rule and the Tribunal’s Rules.</li> <li>- R shared dial-in information for the Tribunal’s hearing, in violation of the Tribunal’s process for facilitating public access to its online hearings.</li> </ul>	\$10,000 against R

			<p>The cumulative effect of the conduct was to undermine both the Tribunal's ability to control its process through Rules and orders, and public confidence in the Tribunal as a safe and effective arbiter of human rights.</p> <p>See <i>Chilliwack Teachers' Association v. Neufeld (No. 10)</i>, <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 49</a> for findings of discrimination.</p>	
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Neske v. Sobeys Inc. (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 37</a>	<p>See above for findings of discrimination.</p> <p>R failed to disclose material documents until the weeks leading up to the hearing. The Tribunal found that R either intentionally withheld key documents or was careless in its search for arguably relevant documents. C was prejudiced by R's conduct in that she was limited in what evidence and arguments she could bring to defend against a dismissal application. The integrity and fairness of the Tribunal's process was undermined.</p>	Costs: \$15,000 against R
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Lloyd v. Fernanda Almeida and others (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 12</a>	<p>See above for findings of discrimination and retaliation.</p> <p>Rs engaged in numerous instances of inappropriate communications amounting to improper conduct</p>	Costs: \$10,000 against R

			<p>throughout the proceedings including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-failing to copy C's counsel on important communication with the Tribunal after the Tribunal directed R to do so.</li> <li>-Discourteous communication with the Case Manager and C's counsel</li> <li>-Disclosing confidential settlement discussions to the Tribunal</li> <li>-Making spurious, inflammatory, and offensive allegations and threats against C and her counsel</li> <li>-Refusing to stop copying C on correspondence despite repeated requests</li> <li>-Blocking C's counsel's emails and threatening to call the RCMP if C's counsel continued to correspond with him, which is required under the Tribunal's Rules</li> </ul>	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Bonnefoy v. Northern Health Authority operating as Wrinch Memorial Hospital</i>, <a href="#">2025 BCHRT 20</a>;</p> <p>Costs awarded affirmed on judicial review: <a href="#">2025 BCSC 1192</a></p>	<p>The Tribunal dismissed C's complaint as she refused to attend the hearing after the first day. The Tribunal awarded costs against C for her disregard of its process and her inappropriate communications directed at the Tribunal's staff and the other party, including their counsel and witnesses.</p>	Costs: \$3,000
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Shahadat v. Northern School of Spa Therapies (No. 3)</i>, <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 120</a></p>	<p>R persisted in making discriminatory and harmful comments about Muslims throughout the complaint process, and threatened to sue C in</p>	Costs: \$2,500 (in addition to \$500 previously awarded in <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 111</a> )

			BC Supreme Court because of his complaint.	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Harvey v. Toby's Liquor Store and others</i> , <a href="#">2024 BCHRT 129</a>	C threatened a witness with police action and engaged in inappropriate communications with an individual respondent.	Costs: \$500
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Kasagoni v. J Singh Enterprises dba Willingdon Husky and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2023 BCHRT 65</a>	R failed to disclose critical and relevant documents. This failure affected C's ability to prove her damages and impacted the integrity of the Tribunal's process.	Costs: \$1,000
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>RR v. Vancouver Aboriginal Child and Family Services Society (No. 6)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 116</a>	See entry above for the Tribunal's findings of discrimination. Regarding costs, the Tribunal found that R failed to meet its disclosure obligations, disclosing significant amounts of highly relevant material after the hearing had already started. In addition, R's counsel behaved improperly when she told one of the witnesses about the testimony and cross-examination of other witnesses in order to allow her to prepare her own evidence.	Costs: \$5,000
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Martin v. Grapevine Optical and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 76</a>	C and her husband both worked for R. C's husband quit his job and filed a WorkSafe complaint against R following an altercation with the employer. C's employment was terminated weeks later. Tribunal found that C's marriage was a factor in her dismissal.	Costs: \$250 against R for failure to disclose relevant documents.
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Perry v. Honu Boat Charters and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2022 BCHRT 68</a>	C was denied employment due to her racial background and spiritual beliefs. On multiple occasions the employer made disparaging	Costs: \$1,000 against R

			comments based on false assumptions founded in anti-Black racism. He also made disparaging comments during the proceeding, which resulted in an award of costs.	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>The Sales Associate v. Aurora Biomed Inc. and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 5</a>	R repeatedly failed to abide by Tribunal directions regarding disclosure. R then disclosed 64 relevant docs 8 days prior to hearing.  Rs also had previous costs award against them in an interim decision for not complying with disclosure obligations: <i>The Sales Associate v. Aurora Biomed Inc. and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 163</a>	Costs: \$1,000 against R
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Gichuru v. Vancouver Swing Society (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 1</a>	C alleged that R banned him from a non-profit society for filing a HR complaint. The HRT found that C had informed Rs of HR complaint strategically once he suspected he would be banned, so he could file a retaliation complaint.	Costs: \$10,000.00 against C  An order that C cannot file a complaint alleging a breach of s. 43 of the Code without leave of the Tribunal.
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Basi v. District of Saanich (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 239</a>	C did not complete a training program required for re-entry into a position he previously held with R and attributed it to a mental disability. C made surreptitious recordings prior to the hearing, disclosed confidential information to a third-party observer, and did not follow tribunal procedure regarding book of documents, witnesses, or communication with R.	Costs: \$2,500.00 against C for persistent misconduct

s. 37 (4)	Costs	<i>Yaniv v. Various Waxing Salons (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 222</a>	C was denied waxing services from a number of small/home businesses and alleged it was because she was a transgender woman. HRT found that the Rs were not trained in the scrotum waxing that C was requesting and refusal to provide service was not discrimination. The Tribunal also dismissed complaints regarding requests for arm/leg waxing as they found they were brought for improper motives and in bad faith.	Costs: \$6,000 total against C - \$2,000 to 3 Rs. HRT only awarded costs to respondents that attended the hearing.
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Jenkins v. Pacific Law Group and another (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 169</a>	C is a lawyer and worked for R. She sustained injuries from a car accident and was terminated shortly after. Discrimination complaint was not successful. C claimed that R counsel retaliated against her by sending applications to third parties with no interest in the proceedings. C argued this and other R behaviour constituted improper conduct worthy of a costs award against R. HRT rejected the majority of C's claims for costs but agreed that issues relating to third parties was deserving of an order.	\$5,000 against R
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Oger v. Whatcott (No. 7)</i> , <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 58</a>	R published and distributed a flyer aimed at stopping C from being elected as an MLA in a Vancouver riding. R is a Christian activist who took issue with C's candidacy as a transgender woman. The panel found R's flyer represented intention to discriminate and was likely to	\$20,000 against R

			expose R and other transgender people to hatred and contempt (s.7 complaint justified). Costs awarded for R's egregious behaviour during hearing.	
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Colbert v. District of North Vancouver</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 40</a>	C repeatedly emailed councilors of R, attacked and insulted R's legal counsel, and threatened to retaliate against R if it did not engage in settlement discussions with him.	\$750 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Smith v. Vancouver Island Motorsport Circuit and others</i> , <a href="#">2018 BCHRT 21</a>	C disclosed documents obtained in the course of litigation to the media in clear breach of Tribunal Rules.	\$1,000 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Gebresadik v. Black Top Cabs</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 278</a>	C drove a taxi for R and was involved in a collision, sustaining a number of injuries. C was unable to fulfil his full duties (he had provided medical note to this effect) and was berated and suspended. Was not provided sufficient shifts with lighter duties.	\$500 against R
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>A and B obo Infant A v. School District C No 2</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 193</a>	Cs contravened a Disclosure Order by failing to disclose despite being put on notice of their obligation and being provided with multiple opportunities to comply. Failure to comply had a significant and detrimental impact on the integrity of the Tribunal's process and prejudiced R's ability to prepare for the hearing.	\$750 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Kono v. Strata Plan LMS 2685 and another</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 143</a>	C made unfounded and vitriolic comments about R during the course of proceedings.	\$3,000 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Pearson v. Dewey Cuttem and Howe Hair and</i>	R refused to communicate with C's counsel, refused to comply with	\$2,500 against R

		<i>another (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 94</a>	Tribunal Rules, deliberately delayed providing evidence, and made needlessly inflammatory allegations.	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Gichuru v. Purewal and another</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCHRT 19</a>	Rs perjured themselves during the hearing of the complaint, including making serious false allegations against C.	\$10,000 against one R \$2,000 joint and severally against both R's
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>C v. Van City</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 103</a>	C's lawyer improperly disclosed information disclosed by R in another proceeding when it had been explicitly stated it could not be.	\$2,500 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Wittworth v. ARO</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 24</a>	R included privileged information in its application to dismiss that it had obtained at a settlement meeting.	\$1,500 against R
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Stein v. Keebler and another (Nos. 2 &amp; 3)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 193</a>	Two awards of costs for improper conduct by C towards Rs for falsely accusing Rs of lying, perjury and faking docs.	\$750 + \$1,000 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Sajid v. Black Top Cabs and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 16</a>	C sought multiple hearing adjournments before withdrawing his complaint on the day of the hearing after it had been adjourned for a year.	\$1,000 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Stein v. Vancouver Coastal Health Authority and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 227</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Stein v. British Columbia (Human Rights Tribunal)</i> , <a href="#">2017 BCSC 1268</a> ; BCHRT decision upheld	C alleged R's counsel had a twin sister attend as witness, hacked her computer and deleted docs. Also failed to timely notify R's counsel that she was asking for adjournment and attempted to enter docs improperly.	\$1,250 against C

<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Ma v. Dr. Iain G. M. Cleator and another</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 180</a>	C fabricated her complaint purposefully, knowingly and repeatedly misled the Tribunal on matters central to her complaint having promised to tell the truth, and admitted to having altered a document and lying to the Tribunal in saying she had not done so. This conduct had a significant impact on the integrity of the Tribunal's process and a significant prejudicial impact on Rs.	\$5,000 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Lim v. Craig's Boyz Trucking and another</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 133</a>	Rs refused to sign a settlement agreement that had been reached despite the adjournment of a previous hearing date on the basis that the matter was settled, delaying resolution of the matter and causing C to incur further costs.	\$1,000 against R  Finding that settlement had been reached
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Harbridge v. Canada Furnace</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 193</a>	Costs for failing to diligently pursue the complaint (not providing disclosure etc.) R asked for actual/unsubstantiated costs of \$95,000.	\$750 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Miller v. Convergys CMG Canada Ltd. (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 185</a>	R failed to provide disclosure despite being advised by the Tribunal that what it had provided in a parallel civil action was insufficient and later being ordered to provide additional disclosure.	R to pay C for the costs of the application, to be determined
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Owimar v. Parking Corporation of Vancouver and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 159</a>	C attempted to adjourn hearing 3 times and finally did not show up to hearing because of a "bad back" but sent his wife. Improper conduct. His case was dismissed at the Hearing	\$2,000 against C

s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Terpsma v. Rimex Supply (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2013 BCHRT 3</a>	On behalf of C, Ms. B made disrespectful and outrageous accusations against R and R's counsel. These included accusations of "perjury", "ongoing history of negligence", "ploy", "muddy the waters", "defaming", "spin on the truth", "obstruct with the natural course of justice", "malice", "criminal nature", "misconduct", "criminal activity", "fraudulent statements", "every trick up their sleeve", "mockery of this process", "very little class", "immaturity", "suicidal to his career", and "further acts of crime".	\$750 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Bishop v. Status Hair Lounge and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 409</a>	C's improper conduct of a serious nature. C failed to appear at the hearing without immediately providing a reasonable excuse to the Tribunal, and he offered to buy a witness statement. The other incidents showed a general thoughtlessness about the resources spent on his account by the Tribunal and the Respondents because of his non-compliance with the <i>Rules</i> .	\$2,000 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Edwards v. Schnitzer Steel Pacific</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 335</a>	C would not abide by settlement agreement and refuted it after the fact. C's cross-application in respect of costs was frivolous and vexatious. The use of inflammatory, derogatory and disrespectful	\$900 against C

			comments constitutes improper conduct.	
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Furtado v. Cold Logic and another</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 227</a>	C did not comply with Tribunal directions on a number of occasions and disclosed information discussed at an early settlement meeting.	\$400 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Malin v. Ultra Care and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 158</a>	C only offered one more day of work after R was made aware of his HIV positive status.	\$500 against R
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Q v. Wild Log Homes and another</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 135</a>	R sexually harassed C on numerous occasions and sued C in BCSC for cost with respect to s.13 (sex – harassment) complaint. Retaliation found, and costs awarded against R for improper conduct during the hearing.	\$6,500 against R
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Dahlquist-Gray and another v. Hedley (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 50</a>	R’s communications to and about both the Tribunal and the Cs were found to threaten the integrity of the Tribunal’s process.	\$1,000 against R to be paid to each C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Han v. Great Central Ma’s Investments and another</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 31</a>	Case dismissed on the merits but respondents’ repeated failure to comply with the Tribunal’s orders (re disclosure) amounted to improper conduct warranting some form of sanction.	\$900 against Rs
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Lungu v. B.C. (Min. of Children and Family Development) (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 341</a>  Judicial Review – Petition dismissed in Oral Judgement, February 20, 2014	C failed to perform disclosure and witness list, disclosed a settlement offer, prolonged the length and cost of the hearing with irrelevant arguments. Complaint dismissed.	\$3,500 against C

		Appeal – <i>Lungu v. British Columbia (Human Rights Tribunal)</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCCA 136</a> : BCSC decision to dismiss the appeal as having been abandoned confirmed		
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Lenhardt-Whitton v. Baltic Properties Group and another</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 326</a>	C failed to attend PHC's and the Tribunal warned her 3 times that her complaint could be dismissed for failure to diligently pursue.	\$125 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Heilman v. First Canada ULC (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 260</a>	C used inflammatory language in submissions, and continued to do so after receiving a warning from the Tribunal to refrain from doing so.	\$750 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Wells v. UBC and others (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 176</a>	C engaged in improper conduct when she made material misrepresentations and failed to disclose material information when she was seeking to have her untimely complaint accepted for filing.	\$5,000 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Alexander v. Real Estate Council of British Columbia</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 104</a>	C made serious and unfounded allegations against Rs and third parties, using inflammatory language, causing a negative impact on the integrity of the Tribunal's processes and unnecessary costs for the Tribunal and Rs.	\$500 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Barta v. Sears Canada and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 289</a>	C deliberately filed a complaint with false allegations and surreptitiously recorded phone calls.	\$3,000 against C

s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Green v. London Drugs and Yen (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 278</a>	C engaged in improper conduct in respect to the unfounded allegations and personal attacks he engaged in the course of his submissions which were replete with unfounded and disrespectful comments to, and about the Tribunal and the other participants in this case.	Case dismissed, no costs awarded
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>C1 and Sangha v. Sheraton Wall Centre and Prevost and Graham</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 206</a>	Cs repeatedly failed to comply with the Tribunal's <i>Rules</i> and direction regarding disclosure, resulting in inefficiency and waste of resources.	\$250 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Ford v. Peak Products Manufacturing and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 155</a>	R failed to reach point of undue hardship when it terminated C after 6 month absence for depression. Costs awarded for improper conduct after R aggressively pursued document disclosure before deadlines were set, made direct document request to C's doctor, and did so while C was unrepresented and suffering from anxiety and depression. R also aggressively pursued C's ex-husband as a witness even though they had divorced prior to the incident, had no relevant info to give, and C had safety concerns regarding the ex. R made this application in the middle of cross examination.	1/3 of legal expenses for improper conduct
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Fletcher v. Meadow Gardens Golf Course (1979) Ltd. (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 148</a>	C failed to disclose medical documentation to R, but attempted to call a psychiatrist to introduce into evidence a report regarding his psychological condition resulting in an adjournment.	\$500 against C

s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Brown v. PML and Wightman (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 93</a>	Rs discriminated against C on the grounds of sex (pregnancy) by way of reacting angrily to her pregnancy, failing to advise her of workplace performance concerns in a timely manner, acting in a hostile and humiliating manner, refusing to allow her to bank her work hours, excluding her from consultation on the development of a new sales structure, and demoting her to a lesser earning job without telling her (C discovered this by reading R's website). R also discriminated on the grounds of family status by cancelling C's flexible working conditions. Costs awarded against R for improper conduct including misleading and untruthful statements in testimony or in affidavits.	\$10,000 against R for improper conduct  Expenses: for witness \$5,656.34 awarded in <i>Brown v. PML and Wightman (No. 5)</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 323</a>
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Grewal v. Simard Westlink and others</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 51</a>	C's false statements and irrelevant comments about employer gave rise to costs. Intimidating a witness gave further grounds.	\$1,000 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Shannon v. The Owners, Strata Plan KAS 1613 (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 438</a>	R made inaccurate and misleading statements to the Tribunal.	Costs to be agreed upon by the parties
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Pivot Legal Society v. Downtown Vancouver Business Improvement Association and City of</i>	R posted an online comment setting out details of a Tribunal-assisted mediation between the parties, contrary to the Tribunal's <i>Rules</i> and an agreement signed at a Tribunal-	\$2,000 against R  (but see Judicial Review note)

		<p><i>Vancouver</i>, <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 372</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – <i>Downtown Vancouver Business Improvement Association v. Pivot Legal Society</i>, <a href="#">2010 BCSC 807</a>: BCHRT decision that R breached its <i>Rules</i> in disclosing details of the mediation quashed.</p>	<p>assisted mediation. Cs suffered prejudice by being unable to give their perspective on R's comments publicly.</p>	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Horn v. Norampac (No. 2)</i>, <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 243</a></p>	<p>C's actions in filing and pursuing this complaint were not based on a good faith belief that his rights under the Code had been violated, but rather on the improper basis that by doing so he might achieve a financial windfall similar to the settlement of the first complaint, punish his employer and supervisors, obtain and retain terms and conditions of employment to his liking, and protect himself from the consequences of his own behaviour.</p>	\$3,000 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>C.S.W.U. Local 1611 obo Foreign Workers v. SELI Canada and others (No. 10)</i>, <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 237</a></p>	<p>Tribunal found it would be inappropriate for post-judgment interest to run on the costs award until the quantum of the costs award was finally determined (between the parties).</p>	<p>Interests deemed to run on costs only after the date R agreed that costs sought by C were reasonable.</p>
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Chaudhary v. Smoother Movers (No. 2)</i>, <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 176</a></p>	<p>Unrepresented R's failure to raise a jurisdictional issue until the beginning of the hearing was</p>	\$6,500 against R

		Judicial Review – Petition allowed in Oral Reasons, June 29, 2012	conduct which, in all the circumstances, a reasonable person would realize was improper.	(but see Judicial Review note)
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Richardson v. Strata Plan NW1020 (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 158</a>	C failed to provide will say statements, and withdrew complaint the day prior to hearing. (Mitigating factors, unrepresented, elderly, fixed income, and had to move from her home of 16 years)	\$1,500 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Vasil v. Mongovius and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 117</a>	C had anorexia, dyslexia, and PTSD schizophrenic and borderline personality disorder. R had limited conception of money or pay arrangements due to disability. Rs did not keep track of C's work hours, did not provide him with accurate payroll documentation, allowed him to perform unpaid work at home, and paid him less than the ESA minimum wage.	\$1,000 against R
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Hughes v. City of New Westminster (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 107</a>	C demonstrated a lack of concern for accuracy in her allegations.	\$500 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>McDougall v. Superior Building Maintenance (No. 8)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 93</a>	The complainant took positions that either exaggerated or downplayed the extent of her disabilities when she believed that such positions would benefit her. She was also untruthful with respect to the “central aspects” of the complaint.	\$1,700 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Principe v. Stong's Markets (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 81</a>	Costs awarded where the R failed to file response reply on time. Later given extension by Tribunal to file Respondent's Reply and A2D. C awarded costs for the delay.	\$500 against R

s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Samuda v. Olympic Industries</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 65</a>	R submitted that C engaged in improper conduct, including failing to participate in PHCs, and repeatedly failing to meet disclosure obligations. R further submitted that C's conduct forced R to file its two pre-hearing applications, which were ultimately not heard because C withdrew her complaint. C also engaged in improper conduct by failing to withdraw her complaint in a timely manner.	\$3,500 against C
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<i>MacGarvie v. Friedmann (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 47</a>  Judicial Review – <i>Friedmann v. MacGarvie</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCSC 1147</a> : BCHRT decision set aside  Appeal – <i>Friedmann v. MacGarvie</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCCA 445</a> : BCHRT decision reconfirmed	R threatened the participants in this hearing, and made unfounded allegations about virtually every party involved, including the Tribunal. He delayed the conduct of this case by his behaviour in the hearing and by his failure to follow the Tribunal's orders and directions.	\$7,500 against R
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Harrison v. Nixon Safety Consulting and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 462</a>	Mr. Ford sexually harassed C in the course of her employment at the Lofts. Mr. Goodman, Con-Forte's representative failed to deal with the harassment when he learned of it. NSC, at the indirect urging of Navigator, terminated her employment soon after she complained about the harassment.	\$3,000 against R for late disclosure
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Buchner v. Emergency and Health Services</i>	R initially approved its employees to attend the hearing as witnesses	\$815.60 against R paid to C on the expectation that

		<i>Commission (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 449</a>	for C with pay, but revoked that approval after the witnesses had already been scheduled to testify and served with orders to attend, causing them to lose their wages for attendance at the hearing.	he would reimburse the witnesses or his legal counsel, who had paid several witnesses disbursements for their lost wages.
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>McKay v. Compass Group and others</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 380</a>	C failed to diligently pursue the complaint in missing a pre hearing conference and failing to respond to an application to dismiss.	\$1,000 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Bedard v. Continental Steel and Rebar and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 351</a>	C failed to comply with order of Tribunal to deliver all medical records and his entire diary. C unrepresented.	\$250 against C Hearing adjourned pending delivery of disclosure documents
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Asad v. Kinexus Bioinformatics</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 293</a>  Judicial Review - <i>Kinexus Bioinformatics Corporation v. Asad</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCSC 33</a> : BCHRT decision upheld	R's racially profiled C in his employment, subjecting him to suspicion of involvement in terrorist acts including reporting him to the RCMP. R failed to ameliorate conditions of poisoned workplace for C. C suffered from physical ailments due to discrimination.	\$5,000 against R for improper conduct during hearing
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Rajput v. UBC and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 256</a>	C's filing of a baseless application for costs, and the further circumstances referred to in paragraphs 39 to 47, [baseless accusations] constituted improper conduct within the meaning of. s. 37(4).	\$3,000 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Hubbard v. Magicuts and [Last Name Unknown] and Regis Corporation</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 236</a>	C repeatedly communicated with Rs inappropriately, failed to respond to correspondence from Rs and the Tribunal in a timely manner, threatened to contact the media and	\$1,500 against C

			Revenue Canada in an inappropriate manner, and failed to comply with Tribunal orders and directions regarding document disclosure issues. Rs were forced to prepare additional applications due to C's conduct.	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Peterson v. Kinsmen Retirement Centre Association and Kines (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 149</a>	Failure to attend a hearing can constitute improper conduct. C led the respondents to believe that she would participate at the hearing, call a significant number of witnesses, and introduce a significant number of documents. C in fact provided no notice to the Tribunal or the respondent that she was not intending to attend the hearing until the day of the hearing and failed to respond to correspondence from the Tribunal asking her to confirm her intentions in this regard.	\$2,500 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Stone v. B.C. (Ministry of Health) (No. 8)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 96</a>	C engaged in improper conduct throughout the proceedings.	\$5,500 against C (see also <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 221</a> )
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Tima v. Red Robin (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2008 BCHRT 76</a>	C raised an unwarranted procedural roadblock to the hearing process, by insisting that a witness was only available at a specific time (an assertion not substantiated by that witness). C gave evidence that was clearly untrue, amounting to a calculated attempt to mislead the Tribunal.	\$1,500 against C

s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Rusiecki v. B.C. Rubber Supply and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 429</a>	C failed to deliver disclosure documents as ordered. Application to dismiss filed and costs.	Complaint dismissed \$250 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Kelly v. ICBC</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 382</a>	C repeatedly communicated with employees of R outside its legal department despite R's requests, disregarded the Tribunal's <i>Rules</i> regarding communication with parties, and refused to accept faxes and mail from the Tribunal and R, unreasonably extending the application process.	\$1,500 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Amofa Mensah v. Killen and Killen (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 359</a>	C not truthful when he testified and made untruthful allegations against R's who were individuals not corp.	\$3,000 against C
s. 37(4)	Costs	<i>Bakhtiyari v. BCIT (No. 6)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 320</a>	C made negatives references about Tribunal staff, accusing them of lying, taking bribes, and being prostitutes, as well as R's personnel and legal counsel. C made unfounded and serious allegations that she emailed to media outlets, politicians, and R's personnel.	\$2,500 against C

<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Azagarar v. Nicholas Shaw and Shaw (No. 7)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 269</a>	C attempted to call eleven witnesses but served orders to attend on them very shortly before the hearing, resulting in applications to cancel the orders to attend and ultimately requiring a rescheduling of hearing dates. C subsequently failed to provide will say statements despite an order to do so.	\$3,500 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Stopps v. Just Ladies Fitness (Metrotown) and D. (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 125</a>	C's conduct, taken as a whole, constituted improper conduct for the purposes of s. 37(4) of the Code.	\$3,000 against C, to be paid in \$500 increments starting 30 days from the date of this decision and every 60 days thereafter until the amount is paid in full.
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Hitch v. Mount Layton Hot Springs Resort (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 78</a>	C failed to comply with the Tribunal <i>Rules</i> and directions to provide complete document disclosure, failed to reply to correspondence from R, and did not respond to the application for disclosure, adjournment, examination upon oath, and costs.	\$250 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Neuls v. Ann Davis Transition Society and Jacob (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 5</a>	C failed to comply with disclosure and submission obligations despite receiving consent to two extensions of time from Rs. Tribunal suggested that the entire fault may not have laid with C, resulting in a lesser award.	\$250 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Glumac v. Fusco and others (No. 4)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 578</a>	C committed many procedural missteps, circulated personal attacks against respondents repeatedly, engaged in "entirely	\$1,000 against C (but would have been higher if the background to the application was different)

			improper conduct”, personally attacked the sitting Tribunal member, was criminally charged in relation to dealings with one R. However, C facing appropriate punishment in criminal court and was of limited financial means.	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Williams v. Calling Foundation and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 489</a>	C sought a second last minute adjournment of the five day hearing set for her matter despite the Tribunal warning her that doing so again could result in an award of costs.	\$250 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Halliday v. Craft Welders and Kastner (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 479</a>	Rs delayed the hearing, left the country, dissolved the corporate R, and did not provide instructions to their counsel so that he would be able to represent them at hearing.	\$5,000 against R
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Ferguson v. Kimpton (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 467</a>	A complaint being justified in part is not a bar to an award of costs against the complainant. C gave untruthful evidence calculated to mislead.	\$400 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Uswak v. MDF Door and another</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 338</a>	Failure of R to file timely Complaint Response, resulting in delay, partly caused adjournment of hearing.	\$1,000 against R
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Chrzanowski v. Mah (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 192</a>	R referred to discussions that occurred at Tribunal directed settlement in his response to complaint. R amended his response, but only on order of the Tribunal, and failed to apologize to the Tribunal or C.	\$500 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Smith v. Jewish Community Centre of</i>	R’s counsel failed to file a reply to C’s response to R’s application to	\$250 against R

		<i>Greater Vancouver and others</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 171</a>	dismiss the complaint due to a change of counsel and erroneous belief that C had not filed his response. The Tribunal found that R's counsel had opportunities to inquire about whether C had filed his response but failed to do so.	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Matthews v. Huckleberry Mines and others (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 93</a>	C did not comply with the Tribunal Rules and directions, repeatedly failing to provide Rs with documents and a list of witnesses in a timely manner as ordered by the Tribunal.	\$250 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Jacobs v. Dynamic Equipment Rentals Ltd. and Stewart (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 353</a>	C failed to disclose documents pertaining to income he earned on eBay after commencing medical leave despite being asked by R to provide documents pertaining to such.	\$500 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Jiwany and Jiwany v. West Vancouver Municipal Transit</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 172</a>  Judicial Review - Petition dismissed in Oral Reasons for judgement August 10, 2006	C was completely untruthful on one point in her testimony, fabricating a telephone conversation in which R threatened to "create a mountain of evidence against her".	\$1,000 against C
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Altakla v. Power and another (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 253</a>	Rs made a second application to dismiss under the same section of the Human Rights Code in the absence of new information or circumstances and outside of the time limit. Rs potentially prejudiced C's ability to have his complaint heard by the Canadian Human Rights Commission.	\$1,000 against R

s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Stone v. B.C. (Ministry of Health Services) and others</i>, <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 221</a></p> <p>Judicial Review – Petition dismissed in Oral Reasons for judgement August 3, 2005</p>	<p>C’s complaint was duplicative of a previous complaint and raised no new issues within the Tribunal’s jurisdiction. C also accused an employee of R of committing perjury in his affidavit, accused Rs of misleading the Tribunal, refused to comply with the <i>Constitutional Question Act</i> as he was required, refused to comply with Tribunal <i>Rules</i>, and posted offensive remarks about Rs’ counsel online.</p>	\$2,500 against C
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Mahal v. Hartley (No. 2)</i>, <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 63</a></p>	<p>C failed to provide a Proceedings Scheduling Form, the particulars of remedy, and his documents and witness list in a timely fashion, only doing so after repeated requests from R and the Tribunal.</p>	\$250 against C
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Bains v. Metro College Inc. and others (No. 2)</i>, <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 7</a></p>	<p>C was untruthful with respect to the fundamental facts of her complaint, namely the racial remark she alleged R made.</p>	\$1,000 against C
s. 37(4)	<b>Costs</b>	<p><i>Fougere v. Rallis and Kalamata Greek Taverna (No. 3)</i>, <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 56</a> (costs award);  <i>Fougere v. Rallis and Kalamata Greek Taverna</i>, <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 23</a></p>	<p>Individual R did not file a response to the complaint, instead contacting the Commission and yelling his assertions to various employees working there. R also made inflammatory, inappropriate, and disrespectful submissions about the Commission’s investigative process. R also was disrespectful in a pre-hearing call, abusive of a Tribunal process server, rude and sarcastic towards the Panel at the hearing, ignored the Panel Chair, attempted to remove a tape of the proceedings</p>	\$5,000 against C

			being made by the Tribunal, ultimately resulting in his being cited for contempt.	
<b>s. 37(4)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<i>Ghinis v. Crown Packaging Ltd. (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2002 BCHRT 38</a>	C repeatedly failed to provide her documents to R despite Tribunal directions and an order to do so, without reasonable excuse.	Costs against C, to be determined between the parties. If the parties cannot agree, the Tribunal will set the amount after submissions from both sides.
<b>s. 43 – Retaliation</b>				
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Lloyd v. Fernanda Almeida and others (No.2)</i> , <a href="#">2026 BCHRT 12</a>	<p>C was a tenant in the basement suite of Rs' home. C had osteoarthritis which was exacerbated by stress and affected her mobility. Rs restricted C's use of parking, storage, laundry and outdoor space. These restrictions adversely impacted C in connection with her disability. Rs conduct was not justified.</p> <p>Rs retaliated against C after she filed her complaint when they terminated her laundry access, turned off the heat in her suite, attempted to evict her on multiple occasions, refused to address mold in her suite, and engaged in surveillance, harassment and intimidation of C and her guests.</p> <p>Rs initiated a relentless, escalating campaign targeting C for adverse treatment because of her</p>	<p>I2D: \$60,000 (discrimination and retaliation combined)</p> <p>Expenses: \$30,596.17 (post-judgment interest)</p> <p>Costs: \$10,000</p>

			disabilities, and retaliated against her for asserting her rights.	
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Employee v. Company and others (No. 2), 2025 BCHRT 157</i>	<p>C was from Iran. C raised concerns after his supervisor and the president of the Company made comments about a world cup soccer game between Iran and another country. C’s supervisor met with C several times asking C to sign a document acknowledging his concerns were oversensitive and agreeing to take steps to better tolerate other’s views in the workplace. C felt he did not fit in in the workplace and feared he would lose his job if he did not sign the document. The Tribunal found that the Rs process of engaging the C in various drafts of the document and asking him to sign it was an adverse impact in employment in which his place of origin was a factor. The Rs conduct was not justified.</p> <p>After C filed a complaint at the Tribunal, the R fired him. The Tribunal found that the R knew about the complaint and found that the termination was retaliation.</p>	<p>I2D: \$35,000 (discrimination and retaliation combined)</p> <p>LW: \$26,250</p> <p>(pre and post-judgement interest on the awards)</p>
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Customer v. The Restaurant and others, 2021 BCHRT 116</i>	R was in a previous HR dispute with C. R went to another local business to warn them against C, calling C a scammer and saying he was trying to solicit support for a lawsuit.	I2D: \$10,000

s. 43	Retaliation	<p><i>Morriss v. Ruth and Naomi's Mission</i>, <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 19</a></p>	<p>R is a faith-based organization that provides a number of services to individuals experiencing poverty, including a shelter with semi-permanent residents. C was residing at R's shelter and objected to R playing religious music and displaying scripture in an area where C waited for showers. C filed complaint alleging discrimination on basis of religion. (C's claim for religious discrimination was dismissed).</p> <p>Soon after filing the HRT complaint, C and another resident of the shelter got into a physical altercation and both were evicted. C sought to return to R's shelter and receiving services but was prevented from returning. Tribunal found that the initial eviction was not retaliation, but R's extended ban of C was retaliatory.</p>	I2D: \$5,000
s. 43	Retaliation	<p><i>Francis v. BC Ministry of Justice (No. 5)</i>, <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 16</a></p> <p>(decision on remedy only; see the prior decision on liability: <i>Francis v. BC Ministry of Justice (No. 3)</i>, <a href="#">2019 BCHRT 136</a>)</p>	<p>C worked at correctional facility. Prior decision of HRT already determined that Rs discriminated against C on the basis of race in nine separate incidents, and that two incidents constituted retaliation.</p> <p>Retaliation occurred after C filed complaint and two different supervisors subjected him to unfair and negative treatment. One</p>	<p>LW: \$761,542 (\$264,060 for past loss of earnings + \$431,601 for future loss of earnings + \$65,881 for pension loss)</p> <p>I2D: \$176,000 (retaliation and discrimination combined)</p> <p>Expenses: \$1,140</p>

			incident resulted in C being issued his only professional reprimand.	Disbursements: \$25,515.24
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>The Sales Associate v. Aurora Biomed Inc. and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2021 BCHRT 5</a>	R retaliated against C by terminating her employment after she made a complaint about sexual harassment/sex discrimination against R.	I2D: \$20,000 (retaliation and discrimination combined)
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>LL v. DM and another</i> , <a href="#">2020 BCHRT 129</a>	C was hired and began a sexual relationship with owner R. R would withhold work from C or bar C from the jobsite when feeling jealous of C's other relationships. After the complaint was filed, R publicized a pornographic video featuring C. Tribunal found C's sex was a factor in the adverse employment-related consequences imposed on C by R for issues arising from their personal, consensual relationship. The Tribunal also found that R's publication of the video was retaliation for filing the complaint.	I2D: \$15,000 (incl post-judgment interest)  LW: \$640  Retaliation: \$7,500
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Beckett and Kuan v. The Owners, Strata Plan NW 2603</i> , <a href="#">2016 BCHRT 27</a>  s. 8 complaint dismissed	Strata retaliated against Cs by imposing fines.	I2D: \$1,000 against R to each C
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>PN v. FR and another (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2015 BCHRT 60</a>	C, from Philippines, was working as a nanny for R, a Hong Kong family living in Canada. R threatened legal action in Hong Kong after C filed a s. 13 complaint (sex; family status; age; race; ancestry; colour; place of origin). The Tribunal found C's complaint justified and R's threats to be retaliatory.	I2D: \$50,000 (retaliation and discrimination combined)

<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Steele v. Aishwarya Investments and another</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 192</a>  s. 10 complaint dismissed	R retaliated when it filed a civil action for damages based on breach of tenancy agreement. Individual R and corporate R order to pay I2D for the stress.	I2D: \$2,500 against corporate R  I2D: \$1,000 against individual R
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Macklem v. Cambie Malone's</i> , <a href="#">2014 BCHRT 56</a>	R breached s. 43 of the Code when it terminated her with two months working notice by letter dated June 30, 2011, and when it terminated her for cause on August 4, 2011 (s. 13 complaint dismissed).	I2D: \$1,000  LW: \$3,000
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Pathak v. City of Vancouver and another</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 195</a>	C filed a s.13 (race) complaint and was subject to a retaliatory suspension (s.13 complaint dismissed).	I2D: \$5,000  Order that R remove letter of suspension from C's file
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Q v. Leonard Walker and Wild Log Homes Inc.</i> , <a href="#">2012 BCHRT 135</a>	Retaliation was found when R sought civil damages for C filing her human rights complaint.  s. 13 complaint (sex – harassment) was justified.	I2D: \$8,000
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Cartwright v. Rona and another</i> , <a href="#">2011 BCHRT 65</a>	R discriminated against C by refusing to allow him to return to his job after he injured his back because they perceived him to have a disability (a weak back potentially susceptible to re-injury). S. 13 (physical disability) justified.  Retaliation occurred when manager yelled at C and had him escorted off the property and threatened to call police when C tried to deliver list of witnesses prior to hearing.	I2D: \$4,000 for discrimination  I2D: \$8,000 for retaliation  LW: \$1,600  Expenses: \$475 for security guard training

<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Stewart v. Habitat for Humanity Victoria</i> , <a href="#">2010 BCHRT 322</a>	C claimed R's removed them from membership for filing complaint, which was found to be retaliation.	I2D: \$3,000  Order that C receive reinstatement of membership
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>C.S.W.U. Local 1611 v. SELI Canada and others (No. 3)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 423</a>	Employer R drew up a petition, stating that those who signed it did not wish to have the Union C represent them in the human rights complaint. The employer R asked individual Cs to sign the petition in circumstances indicating there was a connection between signing the petition and being hired by the employer in the future, which would have had an intimidating and coercive effect.	Costs: unspecified quantum equal to one half of the Union C's actual costs of the hearing until the date submissions closed on the employer R's application to reopen this application  Further instructions on costs issued in <i>C.S.W.U. Local 1611 v. SELI Canada and others (No. 9)</i> , <a href="#">2009 BCHRT 161</a>
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>McGuire v. Peacock</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 264</a>	Both before and after C was successful in establishing discrimination in <i>McGuire v. Better Image Property Maintenance and others</i> , <a href="#">2006 BCHRT 544</a> , one R contacted her via telephone numerous times and called her names.	Order that R cease and desist the contravention only (C sought no particular remedy)
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Clarke v. Frenchies Montreal Smoked Meats and Blais (No. 2)</i> , <a href="#">2007 BCHRT 153</a>	R persistently visited C's new workplace to mock and harass her after filing complaint.	I2D: \$7,500
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Descoteau v. Pare and Wakeside Restaurant</i> , <a href="#">2005 BCHRT 19</a>	R retracted letter of reference after a s.13 complaint filed (sex - pregnancy)	I2D: \$5,500 for both discrimination and retaliation
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Chauhan v. Norkam Seniors Housing</i>	C was told by R to stop preparing ethnic food in her rented property.	I2D: \$2,500 (for both complaint and retaliation)

		<i>Cooperative Assn.</i> , <a href="#">2004 BCHRT 262</a>	The retaliation occurred after Ms. Chauhan filed her complaint (s. 8 – ancestry; race; colour; place of origin) in the form of threat to terminate her sub-lease.	Expenses: \$1,925 for legal fees; \$572.45 for fees paid to an engineering firm; \$73.97 for photocopying, courier, postage, and other costs
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Robb v. St. Margaret's School</i> , <a href="#">2003 BCHRT 4</a>	C, a child with a severe learning disability, attended R, a school. She was refused re-enrollment for Grade 5 because of her mental disability. Rs retaliated against C by refusing to meet with parents after complaint was filed. Rs also wrote an letter to parents about C and C's family during complaint process.	I2D: \$5,000 for discrimination  I2D: \$1,000 for retaliation
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Day v. Poon</i> , <a href="#">2000 BCHRT 4</a>	R called and wrote to C to urge them to drop human rights complaint (s. 13 – sex) if C wanted to keep their job.	I2D: \$1,000 I2D: \$1,000 for retaliation
<b>s. 43</b>	<b>Retaliation</b>	<i>Honey v. Board of School Trustees, School District #43 (Coquitlam)</i> , <a href="#">1999 BCHRT 18</a>	Retaliation occurred when R's lawyers wrote to C to recover expenses related to human rights complaint (s. 13 – physical disability).	I2D: \$2,000