



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

Citation: Ahmed v Wright, 2026 ONLTB 12519

Date: 2026-02-04

File Number: LTB-L-083690-25-RV

In the matter of: Basement Unit, 697 Amaretto Ave
Pickering ON L1X1L7

Between: Sajid Uddin Ahmed Landlord

And

Sherr-Ann Louise Wright Tenant

Review Order

Sajid Uddin Ahmed (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Sherr-Ann Louise Wright (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

The Landlord also applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict the Tenant because:

- the Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Tenant permitted in the residential complex has substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment or lawful right, privilege or interest of the Landlord or another tenant.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-083690-25 issued on January 19, 2026.

On February 3, 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.

Determinations:

1. 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 proceeding or that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
2. The review request submits that the Board Member's denial of the Tenant's adjournment request was unreasonable and in violation of the Tenant's right to participate in the proceeding. The Board's failure to respond to the Tenant's adjournment request filed on January 8, 2026, also hindered the Tenant's ability to participate in the hearing.

3. The presiding Member's decision to deny the adjournment request was not unreasonable.
4. Section 21 of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act, 1990* (the 'SPPA') states that a hearing may be adjourned where it is shown to the satisfaction of the tribunal that an adjournment is required to permit an adequate hearing to be held. Interpretation Guideline 1 of the Board's Interpretation Guidelines states:

Parties should assume that the hearing will proceed on the date stated in the Notice of Hearing. This means that the parties should be prepared to present their evidence, call and question witnesses and make submissions.

...

Both parties are expected to be prepared with their evidence, witnesses, and submissions on the scheduled hearing date, and adjournments are not generally granted because a party is not prepared to proceed.

5. The order confirms that the Member correctly exercised their jurisdiction under section 21 of the SPPA. On review of the Board's records and as stated on paragraph 2 of the order, the Tenant's own adjournment request materials filed on January 8, 2026, confirm that the Tenant was aware of the hearing since December 23, 2025. Accordingly, it was not unreasonable to deny the adjournment request.
6. As per Interpretation Guideline 1, parties should assume that the hearing will proceed on the date stated in the Notice of Hearing. This means that the parties should be prepared to present their evidence, call and question witnesses and make submissions. Although another Board Member may have exercised their discretion differently, the presiding Member's decision is entitled to deference.
7. The Tenants' disagreement with the Member's determinations is not sufficient grounds for review. There is nothing in the record to support a determination that the hearing Member applied improper principles in assessing the adjournment request. I also note that the Tenant was able to participate in the proceeding. For example, paragraphs 11, 22 and 24 of the order demonstrate that the Tenant was able to testify to the reason for the arrears and the circumstances for not having liability insurance.
8. The review request further submits that the order contains a serious error because the Landlord is not the lawful Landlord. However, on review of the hearing audio recording, the Tenant did not raise this issue at the hearing. The opportunity to raise concerns and make full submissions was at the hearing stage not at the review stage of the proceedings. A review is not an appeal or an opportunity to change the way a case was presented.
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 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-083690-25 issued on January 19, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

February 4, 2026
Date Issued

Mayra Sawicki
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.