



Order under Section 31 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

File Number: LTB-T-040634-25

In the matter of: 50 NOBLE STREET
MARKHAM ON L3R8G1

Between: Mylene Goulbourne Tenants
Ian Goulbourne

And

Yanghui Zheng Landlord

Mylene Goulbourne ('MG') and Ian Goulbourne ('IG', the 'Tenants') applied for an order determining that Yanghui Zheng (the 'Landlord'):

- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenant or by a member of their household; and
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant.

This application was heard by adjudicative case conference on January 20, 2026.

The Landlord and the Tenant MG's agent, L. Craney, attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. The Tenant MG's agent helps the Tenant MG navigate legal proceedings, including Board proceedings. At the hearing, MG's agent requested an adjournment. MG's agent testified that MG is a person with a disability that interferes with MG's capacity. MG's agent further testified that MG did not retain legal representation for the January 20, 2026 case conference. MG did, however, retain legal representation to assist with a matter involving the Public Guardian and Trustee.
2. The Landlord opposed MG's agent request to adjourn the proceeding.
3. The Board's application record shows that the Board gave its notice of the January 20, 2026 adjudicative case conference to the Tenants by email on August 28, 2025. The Board's email message was not returned as undeliverable, and I accordingly find that the Tenants were given the notice of hearing on August 28, 2025.
4. Although MG's agent testified that MG is a person with a disability, MG's agent conceded that MG was able to retain a legal representative to work on an unrelated legal issue.

Based on this, I found at the case conference that MG and/or MG's agent, was/were reasonably able to seek legal advice and retain a legal representative to assist the Tenants at the January 20, 2026 case conference date. MG's agent did not provide an adequate explanation for their omission to do so, despite having approximately five months' notice of the case conference. Based on MG's evidence and submissions, I was not satisfied that MG, or MG's agent, exercised reasonable diligence to prepare for the January 20, 2026 proceeding.

5. MG's agent did not explain the Tenant IG's absence from the case conference.
6. Following the Divisional Court's reasons in *Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs'ka*, 2017 ONSC 5541 (Div. Ct.), I denied MG's agent's request to adjourn the adjudicative case conference.
7. The Tenants did not attend the adjudicative case conference to support their application.
8. At the case conference, I found that the Tenants' pleadings did not give sufficient details for the Landlord to know the case to meet, as required by section 183 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006*. The Tenants' vague description of pressure to vacate the rental unit in the summer of 2024, and vague description of alleged behaviour by the Landlord's legal representative, do not give rise to a reasonable cause of action.

It is ordered that:

1. The application is dismissed.

February 3, 2026
Date Issued

Harry Cho
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.