



Order under Section 87 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Bhanot v Akileswaran, 2026 ONLTB 12216

Date: 2026-02-13

File Number: LTB-L-046079-25

In the matter of: 54 TRAYMOOR ST
KINGSTON ON K7L4K8

Between: Harshi Bhanot Landlord

And

Aruthy Kalki Akileswaran Former Tenants
Kabeesha Puvanasritharan
Armandeep Kaur Ghag
Shambavi Navaneethan

Harshi Bhanot (the 'Landlord') applied for an order requiring Aruthy Kalki Akileswaran, Kabeesha Puvanasritharan, Armandeep Kaur Ghag and Shambavi Navaneethan (the 'Former Tenants') to pay the rent and daily compensation that the Former Tenant owe.

This application was heard by videoconference on February 3, 2026.

The Landlord, the Tenants, and the Tenant's Legal Representative Deepinder Loomba and the Tenant attended the hearing. Mr. Loomba only represented Armandeep Kaur Ghag.

Preliminary Issue:

1. Mr. Loomba submitted that the Landlord failed to properly identify the basement unit and did not clearly distinguish between the upper and lower units in the application. I find an amendment to the application, if sought would have cured this issue.
2. Additionally, the agreements between the Landlord and the Tenants were entered into individually with each tenant, along with separate agreements among all tenants. Mr. Loomba submitted the lease agreements between each tenant and the Landlord.
3. The Landlord admitted that she entered into separate lease agreements with each tenant and did not dispute the evidence of the lease agreements.

4. Other issues such as the certificate of service lacking the actual email address, the early termination, and legal costs, were raised and argued both by parties. However, none of these matters were relevant to my final decision on the issue, namely whether a separate lease agreement existed with each tenant.
5. The evidence before me establishes that the Landlord created four separate and distinct tenancy agreements, each with different occupants and terms. Each agreement constitutes an independent tenancy under the 'Act'. Despite this, the Landlord filed a single L10 application attempting to combine all four tenancies into one proceeding.
6. The application fails to properly identify a single tenancy to which the relief sought applies. It is unclear from the application which allegations, evidence, and remedies correspond to which tenancy agreement. This lack of clarity undermines the tenants' ability to know the case they must meet and respond meaningfully.
7. Further, combining multiple independent tenancies into a single application is inconsistent and compromises the fairness and integrity of the proceeding.
8. This prejudices the Tenants by obscuring which evidence and allegations apply to which lease. It also deprives the Board of the ability to assess compliance, arrears, or remedies on a tenancy-by-tenancy basis.
9. I find this is fatal procedural defect, not a minor irregularity. The Landlord's application does not comply with the *Residential Tenancies Act* or the LTB Rules of Procedure and cannot be cured without refiling the application properly. The Landlord should have brought separate applications for each individual tenant for each lease.
10. For all the reasons given above, the Landlord's application shall be dismissed.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlord's application is dismissed.

February 13, 2026
Date Issued

Anthony Bruno
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.