



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

File Number: LTB-T-058421-25-RV

In the matter of: Room 1, 5 GOODERHAM DR
SCARBOROUGH ON M1R3G4

Between: Kaeshavan Chelvachandran Tenant

And

Kaushik Roy Landlords
Hiya Roy

Review Order

Kaeshavan Chelvachandran (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Kaushik Roy and Hiya Roy (the 'Landlords') :

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- altered the locking system on a door giving entry to the rental unit or residential complex without giving the Tenant replacement keys.
- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenant or by a member of their household.
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant.
- withheld or interfered with their vital services or care services and meals in a care home.

This application was resolved by order LTB-T-058421-25 issued on January 12, 2026.

On January 23, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing.

Determinations:

1. The Tenant alleges the January 12, 2026 order contains serious errors.
2. The Tenant submits paragraphs 13 and 14 of the order misstate the evidence with respect to the Tenant's property and the garage at the property. However, my reading of paragraphs 13 and 14 largely reflect what the Tenant's review request states is correct. In addition, paragraph 23 of the order shows the Member accepted the Tenant's testimony concerning the removal of his property from the unit. In any event, the Tenant does not explain how any minor variance between his testimony and the order amounts

to a serious error that would have the potential to change the outcome of the proceedings. This ground is therefore denied.

3. The Tenant claims the Member misidentified the brand of the Tenant's laptop in the order. The order finds the Tenant had an Asus Laptop while the review request states it was an MSI branded laptop. The Tenant does not explain how this finding, even if it is in error, amounts to a serious error that had the potential to change the outcome of the order. This ground for review is also denied.
4. The Tenant's application sought a monetary remedy for property that was disposed of by the Landlord and cash that was stolen from the rental unit. The order does not grant the amount being request but awards a lower amount. Paragraphs 26 to 33 of the order provides sufficient reasons explain that the Tenant provided no cororobaring evidence such as photos or documents to establish the property that was lost or estalblish the amount of cash that was in the unit.
5. The Tenant submits in their request for review that they were not aware of how to present evidence at the hearing. The Tenant states he has multiple photographs and other supporting evidence he can provide to establish his claims, including the amount of cash he had in his possession. The Tenant submits his legal representative advised him not to upload this evidence to TOP.
6. With respect to requesting a review on the basis of new evidence, Interpretation Guideline 8 - Review of an Order states:

Parties are expected to make every effort to produce all relevant evidence in support of their positions in the original hearing. The review will be dismissed unless the LTB is satisfied the new evidence could not have been produced at the original hearing, is material to the issues in dispute and its consideration could change the result. *First Homes Society v Henry*, [2002] O.J. No. 1754, (Div Ct.); NOL-16865-14- RV(Re), 2014 CanLII 78539 (ON LTB).

7. The Tenant has not established that the new evidence could not have been produced at the original hearing. It was in existence and known to the Tenant at the time. The Notice of Hearing sent to the Tenant provides clear instructions on how to submit evidence. That the Tenant or their Legal Representative failed to submit evidence supporting their claims, is not a serious error on the part of the Board and is not good cause for review.
8. LTB decisions are final and binding. A review is not a continuation of a hearing at a different stage. Nor is it an opportunity to change the way that a case was presented to include more persuasive evidence in the hopes of achieving a different outcome. The Tenant's failure to submit additional evidence at the hearing is not a serious error on the part of the Board and this ground for review is denied.
9. 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 a serious error occurred in the proceedings.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-T-058421-25 issued on January 12, 2026 is denied.
The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

January 26, 2026
Date Issued

John Cashmore
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.