



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

Citation: DASU v KAUR, 2026 ONLTB 13583

Date: 2026-02-12

File Number: LTB-L-059257-25-RV

In the matter of: ROOM 1. BASEMENT, 176 CONFEDERATION DR
SCARBOROUGH ON M1G1B1

Between: MOHAMMEDNOUMAN DASU Landlord

And

AMAR JEET KAUR Tenant

REVIEW ORDER

MOHAMMEDNOUMAN DASU (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict AMAR JEET KAUR (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-059257-25 issued on September 25, 2025.

On October 23, 2025, the Tenant requested a review of the order and that the order be stayed until the request to review the order is resolved.

On October 24, 2025, interim order LTB-L-059257-25-RV-IN was issued, staying the order issued on September 25, 2025.

The request was heard by videoconference on November 19, 2025.

The review request was heard by video conference on November 19, 2025.

The Landlord, the Tenant, and the Tenant's legal representative, K. Thoby, attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. The Tenant failed to attend the merits hearing held on September 22, 2025, after which a standard termination order was issued.
2. The Tenant filed her request for a review alleging that she was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing held on September 22, 2025.

3. At the review hearing, the Tenant said that she was aware of the hearing and she was planning to attend. She said that she woke up at 7 a.m. on the morning of the hearing, but because of her pregnancy she went “blank”. She said that she had planned to go to her friend’s house where it was quieter, and there was more reliable wifi, but her friend let her down. The Tenant said that because she went “blank”, and she was pregnant and very stressed by many problems in her life, she was unable to find all the proper details to connect to the hearing. The Tenant submitted into evidence a number of screen shots of calls she made on the morning of September 22, 2025, including numbers that she believed to be the Landlord and Tenant Board. The Tenant said that the only successful call was one made after 11:00 a.m. in the morning when the hearing had finished. She also had screen shots of calls made to legal aid to get help. The Tenant also submitted into evidence documentary evidence of a therapeutic abortion she had scheduled for October 6, 2025.
4. The Landlord did not consent to the review. He submitted into evidence a number of photos of the Tenant on the morning of September 22, 2025, walking around the residential complex. He said that there are photos of her on the property at 9 a.m., when she had written in her request for a review that she was already at the library trying to connect to the hearing at that time.
5. The Landlord submits that the Tenant was reasonably able to participate, but she was negligent and failed to plan for the hearing.
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 for the reasons that follow.
7. Although the Tenant’s screen shots of calls were not dated, I find that the screen shots are nevertheless, more likely than not an accurate representation of the calls the Tenant made on September 22, 2025. However, even had the Tenant made a few calls on that morning, I do not find that means that she was not reasonably able to participate. The Landlord submits that the Tenant was, rather, negligent, and she had failed to plan for her attendance at the hearing. I find that the evidence supports the Landlord’s submission. The Tenant knew about the hearing. She said that she had arranged with a friend to call from her friend’s place, but there is no credible evidence that she did so. If her screen shots are correct, she was calling around to various numbers from early in the morning, but not to the correct number. She could have called the Landlord to inform him of her difficulties, but she did not do that. She and her legal representative said that she had mental health issues, but there was no evidence of that, only evidence of a pregnancy that was scheduled to be terminated a couple of weeks after the hearing. Pregnancy is not a mental health issue.
8. Consequently, I find that the Tenant was reasonably able to participate, she knew about the hearing, but she failed to exercise proper diligence in arranging her attendance.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-059257-25 issued on September 25, 2025, is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.
2. The interim order LTB-L-059257-25-RV-IN issued on October 24, 2025, is cancelled. The stay of order LTB-L-059257-25 is lifted immediately.

February 12, 2026
Date Issued

Nancy Morris
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.