



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

Citation: Hammoud v Chronopoulos, 2026 ONLTB 13474

Date: 2026-02-06

File Numbers: LTB-T-066966-25-RV
LTB-T-069121-25-RV

In the matter of: Ground Floor, 8724 Regional Road 25
Milton Ontario L9T9C1

Between: Ali Hammoud Tenant

And

Nickolaos Chronopoulos Landlords
Mike Chronopoulos

Review Order

Ali Hammoud (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Nickolaos Chronopoulos and Mike Chronopoulos (the 'Landlords'):

- 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. (T2 application)
- collected or retained money illegally. (T1 application)

This application was resolved by order LTB-T-066966-25 issued on January 27, 2026. The review request contained no content as to the reasons for the request. The Tenant was invited to provide the reasons for the review request. On February 5, 2026 the Tenant filed several documents with the LTB, including one entitled "Appendix A requesting a review of dismissal ltb hearings," which contains reasons for the review request. When adjudicating this review request, I reviewed this document.

On January 27, 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.

Note: related matter LTB-T-069121-25 was also dismissed by a separate order issued on January 27, 2026. The Tenant has not requested a review of that order. These two matters were heard together. Order LTB-T-069121-25 addresses the same lack of jurisdiction that resulted in the dismissal of order LTB-T-066966-25. I therefore treat the Tenant's request for a review of order LTB-T-066966-25 to also be a request to review order LTB-T-069121-25.

Determinations:

1. The orders under review dismiss the Tenant's applications because the LTB does not have jurisdiction to adjudicate them. The key facts supporting that the LTB does not have jurisdiction are that the Tenant's allegations are with respect to either a residential tenancy that ended in 2023 at the latest (so the application was filed more than a year after the conduct occurred) or to a non-residential storage and parking arrangement.
2. The Tenant's lengthy review request asserts that the LTB seriously erred by either not granting the Tenant's request for an in person hearing or by not granting the Tenant's adjournment request, which may or may not have been made at the hearing.
3. The Tenant requested an in-person hearing in one sentence with no supporting reasons at the bottom of page two of a 13 page submission attached to application LTB-T-066966-25. Because the Tenant did not do anything to draw the LTB's attention to this request and the Tenant did not mention or repeat this request again, this request was not adjudicated. It appears that despite the fact that this request was never granted and despite the notice of hearing stating that the hearing is by videoconference, the Tenant believed that the hearing would be held in person. It appears that when the Tenant then attended at an LTB office on the hearing date they were told that the hearing is by videoconference. The Tenant went to a coffee shop and attended the hearing by telephone.
4. The Tenant states that a request to adjourn this hearing was denied. There is no mention of this request in the order. There is no hearing recording because this was a videoconference. The way that the Tenant describes the denial of the adjournment request, they did not make this request at the hearing. The Tenant states that when they attended the LTB office, a staff person told them they would have to participate by telephone, the Tenant stated they could not do the hearing that date, and the staff person responded by telling the Tenant that if they do not attend the hearing, a decision would be made in their absence. Although the Tenant interprets this interaction as an adjournment request that was denied, it was not. An adjournment request may only be made to and decided by an adjudicator.
5. The remainder of the review request complains about the Landlord's conduct. The LTB is not responsible for the Landlord's conduct and so these submissions do not identify any error by the LTB.
6. 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-T-066966-25 issued on January 27, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

February 6, 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.