



Order under Section 21.2 of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act and the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

File Number: LTB-T-032299-25-RV2

In the matter of: MAIN FLOOR, 3079 BAYVIEW AVENUE
NORTH YORK ON M2K1G2

Between: MEISAM LAMEIRAMANDI Tenant
Niloofar Karimpouradestani

And

HADI AND SIMONA SAKI Landlords

Review Order

MEISAM LAMEIRAMANDI and Niloofar Karimpouradestani (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that HADI AND SIMONA SAKI (the 'Landlords') :

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant.

This application was resolved by order LTB-T-032299-25 issued on September 12, 2025.

On October 6, 2025, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

On October 10, 2025, interim order LTB-T-032299-25-RV-IN was issued, directing the matter to a review hearing.

The request for review was resolved by review order LTB-T-032299-25-RV issued on November 7, 2025.

On December 4, 2025, the Tenant requested a review of the review order.

On December 5, 2025, interim order LTB-T-032299-25-RV-IN2 was issued, directing this request to a review hearing.

This request was heard by videoconference on December 22, 2025.

The Tenant's Legal Representative, D. Javadi, the Tenant, the Landlords' Legal Representative, N. Ahmed, and one of the Landlords, Simona Saki, attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. In this request, the Tenant's Legal Representative submitted that their office received the Notice of Hearing for the review hearing scheduled on November 3, 2025, however due to an admin error the office calendar was not updated and he was not notified.
2. At the review hearing, the Tenant's Legal Representative submitted that his former administrator was aware of the court date however failed to update the office calendar or notify the Tenant. In support, he provided a copy of an affidavit signed Stacey Ioytcheva into evidence (DOC-6924884pg8). He submitted that the affidavit confirms that she was aware of the review hearing, but due to an administrative error on her part failed to update the office calendar and did not notify him of this scheduled hearing.
3. The Tenant's Legal Representative also submitted that the Landlords had put in a request to reschedule the hearing for November 3, 2025 however did not contact him to seek consent or notify him that they will be requesting an adjournment. He submitted simply because the Landlords had made this request, the Landlords' Legal Representative ought not to have proceeded in the absence of the Tenant or his representative.
4. The Landlords' Legal Representative submitted that the Landlords' request to reschedule has nothing to do with this request for review. He submitted that the Tenant and his Legal Representative were not in attendance at the previous Adjudicative Case Conference scheduled for September 3, 2025 nor the review hearing scheduled for November 3, 2025 although both Notices of Hearing were sent to the Tenant's Legal Representative's correct email address.
5. The Landlords' Legal Representative pointed out that the Tenant's first request for review acknowledged that this email address is the Tenant's Legal Representative's professional email address and now in this review it is submitted that only his assistant received the email sent to this address. The Landlords' Legal Representative submitted that the Tenant's Legal Representative had an obligation to monitor his own email and schedule.
6. The T2 application only provided email address, admin@relionuslaw.ca, for service for both the Tenant's Legal Representative and the Tenant. The LTB used this email address to provide those parties their access PIN to the Tribunals Ontario Portal where they can track the progress of this application.
7. Additionally, the Tenant's first request for review filed on October 6, 2025 provided this same email address, admin@relionuslaw.ca, and it was checked off as the best way for the LTB to communicate with the Tenant, confirming consent to receive documents and correspondence from the LTB by email. As well, in the portion of the review request regarding information about the Representative, this same email is provided for the Tenant's Legal representative.
8. LTB's record confirmed that interim order, LTB-T-032299-25-RV-IN, issued on October 10, 2025 directing the Tenant's request to a review hearing was emailed to admin@relionuslaw.ca on October 10, 2025. As well, the Notice of Review Hearing scheduled for November 3, 2025, was emailed to admin@relionuslaw.ca on October 14, 2025.

9. Based on the evidence and submissions before me, I was satisfied that the Tenant was reasonably able to participate in the proceeding as the Notice of Review hearing was served by email as directed in the request for review and confirmed received at that email address.
10. Guideline 8 of the *Landlord and Tenant Board's Interpretation Guidelines* (the 'Guidelines') provides that the LTB will only exercise its discretion to grant a review when it is satisfied that order contains a serious error, a serious error occurred in the proceedings or the requestor was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. Guideline 8 also provides that the LTB will refuse requests where the requestor's absence was the result of negligence.
11. In *Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs'ka*, 2017 ONSC 5541 (CanLII), the Divisional Court stated that "[I]f parties are not diligent in dealing with legal proceedings then they cannot demand that a Tribunal waste its resources by rehearing matters a second time. To allow this would undermine the ability of the administration of justice to deliver timely cost-effective and final orders."
12. In this case, based on the LTB record, the Tenant's Legal Representative had or ought to have had access to the Tribunals Ontario Portal ('TOP') for this matter which would alert them to the progress of the matter including any hearing dates. Also, I was satisfied that the an interim order directing the Tenant's request to a review hearing was sent to the email address, admin@relionuslaw.ca, provided by the Tenant's Legal Representative in the request for review, which at the very least ought to have alerted him that a Notice of Hearing will follow. Finally, there was no dispute that the Notice of Review Hearing was served and received via email using the address, admin@relionuslaw.ca provided in the request.
13. This request for review is based on a submission of an administrative error occurring in the Tenant's Legal Representative's office after the receipt of the Notice of Review Hearing, namely an employee failing to put it in the shared calendar. This person was not present to give evidence in support of the affidavit submitted or be challenged on the contents of the affidavit.
14. In any event, since this request is based solely on an alleged administrative error, I was satisfied that this submission amounts to negligence on the part of the Tenant's Legal Representative's office and in accordance with Guideline 8 of the Guidelines, the LTB will refuse requests where the requestor's absence was a result of negligence.
15. Further, in accordance with *Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs'ka*, which is binding on the LTB, the Divisional Court held that if parties are not diligent in dealing with legal proceedings then they cannot demand that the LTB hold a rehearing. Parties to a legal proceeding, especially legal representatives have an obligation to be diligent with respect to the matter at all stages. TOP allows parties to a proceeding to view the progress of their matter, hearing dates, and decisions at any time. There was no evidence before me as to why the Tenant or the Tenant's Legal Representative simply did not check TOP after filing the request for review.
16. Consequently, the Tenant's request for review is denied.

Landlord's Request for costs

17. Pursuant to Guideline 3 of the Guidelines, costs may be ordered where a party's conduct in the proceeding was unreasonable. Parties are permitted to file a request to a review of an order, simply because the request was denied does not amount to unreasonable conduct in the proceeding as described in Guideline 3 of Guidelines. Consequently, the Landlords' request for costs of today's attendance and any previous attendance is denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-T-032299-25-RV issued on November 7, 2025 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

January 9, 2026
Date Issued

Lisa Del Vecchio
Member, Landlord and Tenant Board

15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2G6

If you have any questions about this order, call 416-645-8080 or toll free at 1-888-332-3234.