



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

Citation: sidhu v SINGH, 2026 ONLTB 9814

Date: 2026-01-28

File Number: LTB-L-078105-25-RV

In the matter of: Room no 4, 178 HAROLD ST
BRAMPTON ON L6Y2G1

Between: jeenat sidhu Landlord

And

GAGANDEEP SINGH Tenant

Review Order

jeenat sidhu (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict GAGANDEEP SINGH (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-078105-25 issued on December 17, 2025.

On January 22, 2026, 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.

Note: The Tenant's request to extend time and review request were illegible as originally filed as both requests were cropped at the right margin. Board staff asked the Tenant for fully legible requests. These were provided and this order is based on the fully legible requests.

Determinations:

Request to extend time

1. The Tenant's request to extend time to file this review request is granted.

Review request

2. The order under review was made on consent.
3. The Tenant submits that they did not agree to the terms in the consent order, which include a non-voidable termination of the tenancy. The Tenant submits that all they agreed to was the amount owed and a payment plan.

4. I listened to the hearing recording. The Tenant agreed to the terms as set out in the order, including the non-voidable termination of the tenancy. The Tenant did not raise any concerns or request a hearing.
5. The Divisional Court has stated that “parties ought not to be easily able to revisit Board orders that have been made on consent. The effective resolution of matters that come before the Board will be greatly impaired if parties can continually seek to revisit issues that they have earlier agreed to resolve.” (*Trust Construction Corporation v. McKie*, 2017 ONSC 4702)
6. The Divisional Court also stated that “The policy of the courts is to promote settlement. The discretion to refuse to enforce a settlement should be exercised rarely...agreements, and joint submissions, are serious and 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.” (*Gent v. IMH Pool III LP*, 2017 ONSC 7230 CanLII)
7. The review request does not provide a sufficient reason to revisit the consent order.
8. 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 or that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-078105-25 issued on December 17, 2025 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

January 28, 2026
Date Issued

Renée Lang
Vice Chair, 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.