

Before the Yukon Human Rights Board of Adjudication

In the matter of the Yukon *Human Rights Act*

and the matter of

Sophia Hosni (“Complainant”)

&

Yukon Human Rights Commission (“Commission”)

v.

Rhonda Janson and Fritz Mandl (“Respondent”)

BOARD DECISION

Before: Chief Adjudicator Judith Hartling
Adjudicator Carol Geddes
Adjudicator Julie Jai

Appearances

Michael DeRosenroll for

Commission

Sophia Hosni

Complainant

Heard: Whitehorse, Yukon, March 18 and 19, 2025

Written Reasons by:

Adjudicator Judith Hartling

Concurred by:

Adjudicator Julie Jai

Adjudicator Carol Geddes

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND	3
PRELIMINARY DECISION	3
PROCEDURE	5
ISSUES	6
COMPLAINT #1	6
FACTS	6
ANALYSIS/LAW	13
ABSENCE OF RESPONDENT	13
CREDIBILITY	13
MEDICAL REPORTS.....	15
LEGISLATION	15
PERCEPTION AND INTENT	16
TEST	16
FINDING	18
ON COMPLAINT 1 AGAINST RESPONDENT JANSON.....	18
COMPLAINT 2 AGAINST RESPONDENT MANDL	18
REMEDY.....	20

Introduction/Background

1. This matter was referred to the Yukon Human Rights Panel of Adjudicators, (the YHRPA) on the 28th day of November 2023.
2. A hearing was held the 18th and 19th of March 2025.
3. The Complainant alleged that the Respondent, Rhonda Janson (Janson) contravened sections 7(h), 7(i), 9(b), and 14(10(a) of the Yukon *Human Rights Act*, RSY 2002, c116 (the Act) by harassing and/or discriminating against her on the prohibited grounds of physical or mental disability and source of income in connection with any aspect of the occupancy, possession, or lease of the property offered to the public.
4. The Complainant alleged that the Respondent, Fritz Mandl (Mandl) contravened sections 7(a), 9(b), and 14(1)(a) of the Act by discriminating against her on the prohibited ground of ancestry, including colour and race, in connection with any aspect of the occupancy, possession, or lease of property offered to the public.
5. Specifically, the Complainant alleged that she sought to rent a residential unit in Whitehorse owned by Mandl and managed by Janson. She alleged that the Respondent Janson harassed her and made discriminatory comments towards her. She alleged that Mandl made discriminatory comments towards her. She alleged this occurred when she chose not to rent the unit, requested her deposit be returned, and went to retrieve her belongings.

Preliminary Decision

6. Both the Respondents Janson and Mandl failed to attend the hearing.

7. Janson had notice of the hearing, notice of prior Case Management Conferences, and received requests from the Registrar of the YHRP (Registrar) to comply with the terms of the Act, Regulations, and YHRP Rules of Procedure (Rules).

8. Mandl had notice of the hearing, notice or prior Case Management Conferences, and received requests from the Registrar to comply with terms of the Act, its Regulations, and Rules.

9. The Registrar of the YHRPA advised the panel that:

On January 23, 2025, I sent copies of the case management conference orders for January 14, 2025, and January 20, 2025, to Ms. Hosni, Ms. Grady, and Ms. Janson.

On January 27, 2025, I delivered copies of the case management conference orders to Mr. Mandl which included details about the time and location of the hearing, and confirmation that Mr. Mandl had agreed to attend in person at the case management conference. I received an email from Ms. Grady indicating that Ms. Janson, now Ms. Sam, had phoned her twice looking to get in touch with me, the Registrar, because she had received some documents/notices. Ms. Sam left a phone number to contact her. She mentioned that she lives in Mexico and does not regularly monitor her Canadian phone. In her second call, she asked for my contact information. I phoned Ms. Janson and left detailed information regarding the hearing.

On February 20, 2025, I sent a notice of hearing to all parties by email.

On February 21, 2025, I delivered a copy of the notice of hearing to Mr. Mandl, along with information about the Handi bus and a list of taxi companies and phone numbers in Whitehorse. I reminded him of the hearing dates, time, and location and told him I would phone him the week beforehand to remind him again.

On March 10, 2025, I phoned Ms. Janson using the number I had on file, and the number was no longer in service.

On March 12, 2025, I phoned Mr. Mandl to remind him of the hearing dates, time, and location and told him I would phone him the day before to remind him again.

On March 17, 2025, I phoned Mr. Mandl to remind him of the hearing, and he informed me he was not going to attend.

10. The panel was satisfied that, pursuant to s. 23.1 of the Rules which states

If satisfied that a party was served with a notice of the hearing under rule 14, the Board may proceed with the hearing in the absence of that party.

s. 14.1

The Registrar shall consult with and serve on the parties notice of the hearing date(s), sitting times and location of the hearing in Form 4.

and following *Simon and Simon and the Yukon Human Rights Commission v. Swallows*, File

Reference: 2026-1 and 2016-02, 3rd paragraph, pg. 2, which states

The Respondent did not attend the hearing. She participated in some pre-hearing procedures, including submitting the forms required by the Panel's Rules of Procedure and attending a pre-hearing conference on November 9, 2016, at which hearing dates were set. However, she failed to attend a second scheduled case management conference on January 17, 2017, and could not be reached by telephone. Subsequently, the Respondent emailed the Registrar that she would not attend the hearing. In light of these facts, the Board was satisfied that the Respondent had adequate notice of the hearing and that it was appropriate to proceed in her absence.

it could proceed in the absence of the Respondents and did so.

Procedure

11. The hearing was conducted in person save for the attendance of witness Aeson who attended via Zoom.

12. The Commission presented its case by calling two witnesses, one being the Complainant, the other being her sister Sloane Aeson.

13. The Complainant elected to not call further witnesses or provide further evidence relying on the Commission's presentation.

14. The Commission provided oral argument. The Complaint chose not to provide argument, relying on the Commission's submissions.

Issues

15. The issues are identified as follows:

- 1) Did the Respondent Janson discriminate against and/or harass the Complainant on the basis of physical or mental disability and source of income contrary to subsections 7(h) and 7(l) of the Act when communicating with the Complainant about the return of her rental deposit?
- 2) Did the Respondent Mandl discriminate against and/or harass the Complainant on the basis of ancestry, including colour and race, contrary to subsection 7(a) of the Act when communicating with the Complainant and her sister while the Complainant retrieved her belongings from the rental unit?
- 3) If so, was the Respondent's conduct for a reasonable cause pursuant to section 10(d) of the Act, or was there a bona fide and reasonable justification for the discriminatory treatment?

Complaint #1

Facts

16. The Complainant gave evidence that she had read a Facebook (FB) ad advertising a basement suite for rent.

17. She responded to it and received an answer from the Respondent Janson. They then met in person to discuss the rental in November 2020. The meeting took place outside the Whitehorse General Hospital. This was pursuant to the Complainant's request as she was visiting her grandmother who was a patient. The Complainant thought the conversation with the Respondent went well. She thought that the Respondent Janson owned the suite.

18. The Respondent asked the Complainant if she was employed to which the Complainant advised she had three jobs. There was no evidence led as to what the jobs

were. The Respondent advised she was a business owner and very busy. The Respondent asked where the Complainant was living to which the Complainant answered, "With her former partner in Whitehorse." The Complainant said she was a recovering drug addict to which the Respondent replied that she was as well and that, while recovering, she stayed at the Respondent Mandl's suite.

19. A few days later, on November 20, 2020, a second meeting occurred. They met on Main Street in front of the Baked Cafe. The Respondent Janson wanted to show the suite to the Complainant. She also asked for a \$500 security deposit. The Complainant provided the \$500 deposit. They went on a brief tour of the suite. The suite was in a "regular" house with an "add on" and a business attached to it.

20. The Respondent shared that she was a user (or had been) a user of crack cocaine and did so in the bathroom of the suite which the Complainant was to rent.

21. A third meeting was held.

22. The Respondent presented a lease of the premises to the Complainant to be signed. The Complainant signed and the Respondent signed.

23. At some point, the Respondent took the Complainant to an estate sale. The Complainant purchased a dresser, lamp, table and some art.

24. The Complainant moved some of her belongings into the suite around November 26th.

25. The Complainant showed the lease to her sister, Sloane Aeson. Her sister advised that there were inconsistencies and that she should attend at the Residential Tenancies Office (RTO) for advice.

26. She did.

27. The RTO advised that, "It wasn't a good lease."

28. On November 26, 2020, at 4:51 p.m., the Complainant sent an iMessage to the Respondent Janson advising:

... I have decided moving at this time does not look like a good option right now with Covid increasing in Whitehorse...

and providing an address for return of the security deposit.

29. She does not expressly state she is reneging on the lease or requesting the return of the monies; she only says it's not a good idea to move and then provides an address for return of monies. However, it was understood that she did not want to rent the apartment and wanted her deposit back.

30. The Respondent responded at 6:30 p.m. via iMessage advising, "You can get it when I arrive not a problem the furniture"

31. The Respondent was in Miami on a holiday.

32. The Complainant simultaneously sent messages via FB, on November 26, at 4:50 p.m. to the Respondent.

33. The Respondent replied:

I is m travelling. Al have had no sleep we have been travelling for 27 hours we just landed in Miami I'm exhausted I need to read your text when I get to my hotel or tomorrow morning we have not slept a wink for 27 hours straight Sophie I'm sorry I just saw your message now as I landed and waiting for luggage exhausted too tired to read I will phone or attend I'm not right this minute I'm so sorry I will get to you please and thank you.

34. The Complainant responds with a FB message stating: "... will speak tomorrow."

35. At 6:02 p.m., the Complainant receives 12 notifications of FB messages that had been unsent from the Respondent. She does not reply.

36. The Complainant follows this with an iMessage on November 27, 2020, at 3:29 p.m., and a FB message at 3:30 p.m., again requesting the return of the security deposit and adding that she needed access to the suite within 48 hours to collect her possessions. Further, she wrote that the RTO advised her the suite was not "legal" having insufficient access and egress points, that the lease was not legal, and that the Respondent had 15 days to return the deposit.

37. The Respondent replied to the FB message saying that there is no issue with returning the deposit and asking for a picture of the contract. She indicates to the Complainant that she needs to wait for the Respondent's return from Miami.

38. The Complainant then received 18 iMessages from the Respondent, 30 seconds apart.

39. The Complainant received an additional 30 iMessages at 10:03 p.m. The messages referring to prohibited grounds were:

Friday, Nov 27, 10:03 PM

Add to that my dear I will be asking and contacting both social assistance to make sure you didn't collect a check by using the agreement, then getting a check, JUST making that clear. You were told it was my own dwelling and there was access you had the upstairs and down.. There are 4 ways to get out of there! If your so stoned on drugs well I guess that would be up to you to nit find your way out., 🤔🤔🤔

...

You were informed about everything . So your causing drama for your own reasons. And you went up social services! I know already . So I now what you did. Small town young lady

...

I thought you were a nice young lady but a drug user and uses individuals for your own reasons. Unbelievable.

I will see you to square up no problems When I get back

I need the rental agreement I kindly trusted you with to photo it up me if nit take me to court

Because my lawyer is absolutely ready for any grief.

40. On November 28th, the Complainant responded via iMessages and FB messages, stating, "... this isn't up for debate or negotiation," and advising that if she is not allowed access to her possessions by the end of the day on November 30 and is receiving no payment by December 12, that she would file a Dispute Resolution with the RTO.

41. The Respondent responded to the iMessages on November 29th, stating that the Complainant gave short notice and knew that the Respondent was out of the territory. The Respondent stated they would get everything done upon her return. The Respondent restated her request for the photos of the contract.

42. The next iMessage is sent on Friday by the Complainant at 4:26 PM. The message was not dated. In the message, the Complainant states that she has not received the

\$500 deposit, and that if she doesn't receive it by December 12th, she will file for a Dispute Resolution Hearing with the RTO.

43. The Respondent replied on Friday and Saturday. Again, the messages were not dated.

44. The messages referring to the prohibited grounds were sent by the Respondent on Friday at 7:41 PM:

You were very very OK with gas as you were so desperate to leave your boyfriend and your abusive relationship that you were in and the drug attic world you had been in! I sympathize with you I felt for you so I told you this was not a place that you could collect a welfare check I would give the space to you helping you well as a baking person from nowhere to go other than to an abusive boyfriends house!. Yeah rental agreement I had given you is a copy of the legal agreement on line for their tenancy of Whitehorse act! I told you Dan and it something to sign in case legal or illegal actions happened at the dwelling that I had personally rented to you that would give me a back up for anything that could happen you knew all of this! You explained your addiction habits tell me individually you were living with at the moment and needed to get out and we're desperate to get out of that situation. I would not know this if you are playing your self as I would not tempt to rent and chance but I did with you.

45. Between November 26 and November 29, the Complainant received 49 iMessages, eight FB messages, and 12 notifications of FB Messages that had been unsent from the Respondent. The majority of the iMessages appear to be sent in batches on November 27, in response to messages sent by the Complainant at 3:29 PM, and on November 27 at 10:03 PM.

46. The Complainant testified that she received approximately 20 phone calls from the Respondent, beginning around 11 PM, following the last batch of text messages received on November 27 at 10:03 PM. All of those phone calls went unanswered.

47. The Complainant testified that the following day, being November 28, the Respondent left the Complainant a voicemail message berating her and calling her down in a threatening manner. The Complainant's voicemail deletes after three days.

48. The Complainant gave evidence that she was not receiving Social Assistance at the time, nor had she ever received Social Assistance.

49. The Complainant said she became overwhelmed, confused, and concerned. She was concerned the Respondent would take legal action against her. She felt threatened and that the Respondent might be feeding false information about her to others.

50. The comments about Social Assistance "didn't make her feel good; she was in a vulnerable situation with her partner".

51. She felt used and betrayed by the Respondent as she had shared her drug issue with the Respondent who then shared confidences with her about her own addiction.

52. On December 13, 2020, the Complainant filed an application with the RTO for return of the security deposit of \$500.00 that she had made.

53. The RTO granted the application.

54. The Complainant followed with collection incurring net costs of \$330.05.

Analysis/Law

Absence of Respondent

55. Because of the lack of participation, that is, the Respondent's absence from the hearing, and therefore no cross-examination of the witnesses, the Board paid particular attention to the credibility of the witness.

See: *Quenneville* 2013 Carswell Yukon 152 YHRT pg.13

See: *Simon and Simon v. Swallows* 2017 CanLII 150013 (YK HRC) pg. 15

Credibility

56. According to *Faryna v. Chorny*, 1951 CanLII 252 (BCCA) (1952) 2 DLR 354

*If a trial Judge's finding of credibility is to depend solely on which person he thinks made the better appearance of sincerity in the witness box, we are left with a purely arbitrary finding and justice would then depend upon the best actors in the witness box. On reflection it becomes almost axiomatic that the **appearance of telling the truth** is but one of the elements that enter into the credibility of the evidence of a witness.*

*Opportunities **for knowledge, powers of observation, judgment and memory, ability to describe clearly** what he has seen and heard, as well as other factors, combine to produce what is called credibility, and cf. *Raymond v. Bosanquet* (1919), 50 D.L.R. 560 at p. 566, 59 S.C.R. 452 at p. 460, 17 O.W.N. 295.*

*A witness by his manner may create a very unfavourable. The credibility of interested witnesses, particularly in cases of conflict of evidence, cannot be gauged solely by the test of whether the personal demeanour of the particular witness carried conviction of the truth. The test must reasonably subject his story to an examination of its **consistency with the probabilities***

that surround the currently existing conditions. In short, the real test of the truth of the story of a witness in such a case must be its harmony with the preponderance of the probabilities which a practical and informed person would readily recognize as reasonable in that place and in those conditions. (Emphasis added)

57. From this case we can synthesize:

- That demeanor of the witness, while giving evidence, is considered but additional factors are to be considered, such as:
 - Knowledge of the matter — Here the Complainant had intimate knowledge as incidents occurred directly to her.
 - Powers of observation — Here it was obvious in the giving of evidence the Complaint could see, hear, and read so had full access to the comments made to her and, in particular, the text messages.
 - Memory — She needed to refresh her memory from the notes made by her at the original making of the complaint. However, this involved details such as dates but not the substantive facts of what occurred.
 - Ability to describe — She had a command of English in which to give her evidence, she was coherent and logical.

58. In addition, and importantly, the witness was able to produce corroborating evidence. This was the printout of the texts and calls made by the Respondent as shown on the Complainant's phone. In fact, this is the central evidence of the alleged harassment.

59. As such, her evidence was consistent with the probabilities that surrounded the current conditions.

60. The Board found the Complainant to be credible giving consistent and reasonable evidence.

Medical Reports

61. The Board accepts the evidence given by the Complainant that she was a recovering drug addict. She gave evidence that she had told the Respondent of her drug recovery, and the Respondent offered her own addiction information. The Complainant also simply gave evidence to the Board that she was a recovering addict.

Ms. Stevens for the appellant suggests that there is a principle of law that medical evidence is necessary to establish an impairment of earning capacity. With respect, that is not the law. The question is whether on the whole of the evidence the verdict of the learned judge is supportable. On the evidence here including that of the plaintiff which he accepted it was open to him to make a finding of impairment, as he did here, and to assess it at \$40,000. That being so, I would dismiss the appeal. Miscisco v. Small 2001 BCCA 576 para 2

62. Her evidence is the “whole of the evidence” as referred in the *Miscisco* case. It is credible and supportable. The Board accepts this without the need of a medical report.

Legislation

63. The Yukon *Human Rights Act* speaks to prohibited grounds and reasonable cause:

7 Prohibited grounds

It is discrimination to treat any individual or group unfavourably on any of the following grounds

- (a) ancestry, including colour and race;*
- (h) physical or mental disability;*
- (l) source of income;*

10 Reasonable cause

It is not discrimination if treatment is based on...

- (d) other factors establishing reasonable cause for the discrimination.*

14 Harassment

(1) No person shall

- (a) harass any individual or group by reference to a prohibited ground of discrimination;*
- (b) retaliate or threaten to retaliate against an individual who objects to the harassment.*

(2) In subsection (1), “harass” means to engage in a course of vexatious conduct or to make a demand or a sexual solicitation or advance that one knows or ought reasonably to know is unwelcome

Perception and Intent

64. The Complainant gave evidence she had never received social assistance.

65. The issue then is: Can the Respondent harass or discriminate on the basis of receipt of social assistance if the Complainant, in fact, isn't on, nor has she been on, Social Assistance?

It is common ground that a person who is perceived to have the characteristics of a person who falls within one of the enumerated grounds in s.8 may be the object of discrimination.

School District No. 44 (north Vancouver) v. Jubran, 2005 BCCA 201 (CanLII)

66. The Complainant was discriminated against on the prohibited ground 7(l) of source of income when the Respondent referred to Social Assistance in the texts even though the Complainant wasn't on social assistance. It is sufficient that the Respondent thought she was on social assistance.

Test

67. According to the Moore test:

The complainant must show prima facie discrimination.

1.The Complainant must show she has a characteristic protected from discrimination under the code.

2.That she experienced adverse impact from the Respondent's conduct.

3.and that the protected characteristic was a factor in the adverse impact.

If the criteria are met then the burden shifts to the Respondent to justify the conduct within the exceptions in the Act.

See: Moore v. British Columbia (Education) 2012 SCC 61 at para. 33

68. The Board found that Social Assistance remarks were the protected ground of “source of income”, in s.7(l) of the Act. The Board accepted that a drug addiction is a physical/mental disability, s.7(h) of the Act.

69. The Complainant gave evidence of the adverse effects of being overwhelmed, confused, concerned, and that she felt vulnerable, didn’t feel good, and felt betrayed by the Respondent.

70. The Complainant suffered the adverse effects from the discriminatory remarks made by the Respondent concerning social assistance and drug addiction.

71. The Respondent offered no justification.

72. The Board found the Complainant met the *Moore* test of prima facie discrimination.

73. Section 14 of the *Yukon Human Rights Act*, R.S.Y. 2002, c. 116 prohibits harassment by reference to a prohibited ground and defines harassment as follows:

s. 14.(2)

1. a course

2. of vexatious conduct

3. that one knows or ought reasonably to know is unwelcome

74. The Respondent sent a total of 48 texts in a short period, and 20 calls, and one voicemail message over a period of two days. The majority of the texts occurred in a bunch of 18, and again in a bunch of 30. The texts were 30 seconds apart. There is a degree of repetition, or a course of conduct. It was distressing to the Complainant. (See *Ghosh v Domglas Inc.*, 1992 Carswell Ont 6682 para 32.)

75. They were vexatious, and they included derogatory comments accusing the Complainant of:

- being on social assistance, scamming the process; and
- of being a drug addict.

76. The Board considered *Simon v Sallows*, 2017 CanLII 150013 (YK HRC, File Ref 2016-1 and 2016-2):

The question of whether a respondent knew or ought to have known the conduct was unwelcome requires the Board to consider whether a reasonable person in the circumstances would have known that the conduct was unwelcome.

77. The Board found the conduct was unwelcome and that a reasonable person would have known that the conduct was unwelcome.

Finding

On Complaint 1 against Respondent Janson

78. With allegations of discrimination and harassment on the grounds of physical or mental disability and source of income, the Board finds that the Respondent Janson did discriminate against the Complainant on these grounds and further did harass her.

Complaint 2 against Respondent Mandl

79. Two witnesses were called by the Commission relating to the second complaint.

80. Sloane Aeson, sister of the Complainant, gave evidence. She was at the suite to assist the Complainant in retrieving her belongings. This was on November 30.

81. The Respondent had said to the witness Aeson:

- You girls are just a couple of tee pee burners, collecting a cheque and then moving on to the next one.
- All you need in this town is to be a chief and have a feather... and you get what you want.
- You girls are just a couple of Indians, off to your next scam.

82. The witness had not filed a complaint.

83. The Complainant was in the vehicle waiting for her sister when the comments were made. The Complainant gave evidence that she did not hear the remarks made by the Respondent Mandl. When her sister entered the vehicle, she told the Complainant that the Respondent had said: "You girls are just a couple of teepee burners."

84. This was the only remark her sister repeated to her.

85. She was shocked, but she had found the Respondent easy to deal with when they retrieved the possessions.

86. Both witnesses gave evidence that initially the Respondent Mandl refused entry wanting them to wait until the Respondent Janson returned from Miami. The witness then called the RCMP, who attended. A call with the Respondent Janson occurred. The matter was sorted out and entry gained.

87. The comment the Complainant received was hearsay as it was from the witness Aeson. Aeson repeated only one of the remarks made by the Respondent. It was momentary and the Complainant indicated that it did not have a lasting impact on her.

88. The Board does not find this meets the prima facie case required by *Moore, supra*. Therefore, there is no finding of discrimination or harassment with respect to the Respondent Mandl.

Remedy

89. (a) The Respondent Janson shall pay damages to the Complainant for injury to dignity, feelings, and self-respect as per paragraph 24(1)(d) of the *Act*.

90. In *Sanford v, Koop*, 2005 HRTO 53, the tribunal found the following non-exhaustive factors to be considered relevant to damage assessment:

- Humiliation experienced by the complainant
- Hurt feelings experienced by the complainant
- A complainant's loss of self-respect
- A complainant's loss of dignity
- A complainant's loss of self-esteem
- A complainant's loss of confidence
- The experience of victimization
- Vulnerability of the complainant
- The seriousness, frequency and duration of the offensive treatment[.]

91. The Complainant gave evidence she felt overwhelmed, confused and concerned. Her concern was legal action being taken by the Respondent as against her and of false information being said about her to others. She felt vulnerable given the situation with her partner and not feeling good about the Social Assistance comments. She felt betrayed by the Respondent. These comments created hurt feelings, a loss of dignity, and vulnerability.

92. The seriousness of the comments compared to a person losing their job, see *Kvaska supra*, is minor.

93. Although there were 48 text messages and 20 calls, all of it occurred for a brief period of time being four days.

94. All communication was via texts, FB, or phone calls. There was no in-person confrontation and intimidation. Each text and call were brief. The calls weren't answered. In evidence is a list of calls. There is no transcript of any voicemails being left. Merely a list of calls.

95. In mitigation:

- the Complainant did not answer any of the calls. She might have mitigated the harassment, that is the need for 20 calls being placed and one voicemail message being left, had she answered the first call.
- The Complainant did not respond to the Respondent's request for a picture of the lease. Again, this cooperation might have mitigated the situation.

- After the first text sent by the Complainant, the Respondent, in an immediate text, agreed to the return of it and the return of her possessions “when she got back”. The Respondent did not refuse to return the deposit or that the Complainant take possession of her property.

96. After the second text sent by the Complainant 24 hours later, in which text the Complainant advised that the RTO deemed the lease and premises illegal, that the deposit was to be returned in 15 days, and the Complainant stated that she wanted access to her property within 24 hours, the Respondent again advised that there was no problem with returning the deposit and obtaining her possessions.

97. The Complainant cancelled a lease on short notice and did not appear to consider the logistical difficulties the Respondent was experiencing being in Miami and being asked to deal with the matter.

98. There was no evidence led that time was material in obtaining the possessions.

99. In determining an appropriate award, the Board must bear in mind that the purpose of remedies under the human rights laws are to compensate complainants for the harm of the discrimination, not to punish the Respondent. See: *Hureau v. Yukon Human Rights Board of Adjudication*, 2014 YKSC 21.

100. The Board orders that the Respondent Janson shall pay damages in the amount of \$2,500.00.

101. The Respondent Janson shall pay damages to the Complainant for financial loss of \$330.05 suffered because of the discrimination as per paragraph 24(1)(c) of the *Act*.

102. Post-judgement interest in accordance with Judicature Act RSY 2002, c.128 s. 36 is ordered.

Signed: At Whitehorse, Yukon on April 19, 2025



Judith Hartling,
Chief Adjudicator for the Yukon Human Rights Board of Adjudication



Carol Geddes, Panel Member



Julie Jai, Panel Member