



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

Citation: SKPM Rents 4 v ZELSMAN, 2026 ONLTB 2351

Date: 2026-01-02

File Number: LTB-L-074665-25-RV

In the matter of: 305, 7 JACKES AVE
TORONTO ON M4T1E3

Between: SKPM Rents 4 Landlord

And

FRANCINE ZELSMAN Tenant

Review Order

SKPM Rents 4 (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict FRANCINE ZELSMAN (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-074665-25 issued on December 10, 2025.

On December 30, 2025, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing. In determining this request, I reviewed the materials in the LTB's file as well as the audio recording for this hearing.

Determinations:

1. The order that the Tenant seeks to review is a consent order. The Tenant submits that the order contains a serious error because her tenant issues were not heard, not hearing the issues was a denial of procedural fairness, the remedy ordered is not appropriate, the Tenant did not have a legal representative, and that she did not understand the consequences of the order.
2. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order or that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
3. The Board's procedure is that mediation discussions are not recorded but that once terms of consent are reached, those are recorded. I have listened to the recording. The order accurately reflects the terms agreed upon by the parties.

4. There is nothing in the recording that supports that the Tenant did not freely enter into the consent order or that the Tenant did not understand what she was agreeing to. That the Tenant did not have a legal representative does not alone establish that she was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. Many parties before the Landlord and Tenant Board represent themselves. The recording reflects that the terms of the consent order were explained to the Tenant and that the Tenant confirmed that she understood and agreed to them. The Tenant did not request an adjournment or any form of accommodation to assist in participating in the proceeding. The Tenant also did not lead evidence of incapacity. Nothing in the hearing recording supports an objective finding that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
5. That the Tenant now disagrees with the terms does not mean that the Board made a serious error. A review is not an opportunity to change the way a case was presented. If the Tenant wished to lead evidence about tenant issues, her opportunity to do that was at the hearing or in her own tenant application. That the Tenant chose to resolve the Landlord's application without any compensation for her tenant issues does not establish that a serious error occurred.
6. The Divisional Court in *Gent v. IMH Pool III LP*, 2017 ONSC 7230 confirms that "agreements, and joint submissions, are serious and that they should not be easy to simply overturn. To allow parties, after the fact, to raise claims they could have or allow second thoughts after an agreement is struck would cause unnecessary waste on our Tribunals and Courts. No one, even with an order, would feel safe to rely on what has been agreed to. This would not be a just result."

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-074665-25 issued on December 10, 2025 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

January 2, 2026
Date Issued

Amanda Kovats
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.