



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

Citation: Liegghio v Teherany, 2026 ONLTB 13644

Date: February 13, 2026

File Number: LTB-T-040120-24-RV

In the matter of: 317, 608 Richmond Street West
Toronto, ON M5V0N9

Between: Matthew Liegghio Tenants
Celina Pecchia

and

Humza Teherany Landlords
PSR Brokerage

REVIEW ORDER

Procedural History of Application

Matthew Liegghio and Celina Pecchia (the 'Tenants') applied in a T1/T2 application seeking an order determining that Humza Teherany and PSR Brokerage (the 'Landlord') charged an illegal charge; and did not use the Tenants' last month rent deposit to pay for the last rental period and did not return the deposit.

The T1/T2 application was heard by videoconference on October 15, 2025. Only the Tenants attended the hearing. The applications were resolved by order LTB-T-040120-24 issued on December 12, 2025 (the 'T1/T2 Order'), which dismissed the T2 application and ordered some remedies for the T1 application.

On January 12, 2026 a potential party (Hadi Taherany), through their legal representative Ghadeer Jwad (paralegal), requested a review and stay of the T1/T2 Order, alleging serious errors and that they were not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.

Review interim order LTB-T-040120-24-RV-IN issued January 14, 2026 stayed the T1/T2 Order and directed the request for review to a hearing.

The review hearing was conducted by videoconference on February 2, 2026. The potential party's legal representative Ghadeer Jwad (paralegal) attended the review hearing. The Tenants also attended the review hearing. The matter was stood down several times during the proceeding; but at every resumption (ie: at 10:16am, 10:26am, 10:48am) the potential party was not present despite the legal representative being given time to contact her client.

Determinations:*Potential Party Given No Standing for Applications*

1. The potential party's legal representative raised a preliminary issue that the Landlord is actually Hadi Taherany, her client. She submitted there had been another application at the LTB where Hadi Taherany was listed as one of the landlords for this rental unit.
2. I note the LTB's file LTB-T-032316-25 was a T2 application filed by the same Tenants on April 18, 2025, against 3 landlords: Humza Teherany, Hadi Teherany, and Sean Chase.
3. The Tenants did not dispute that Hadi is Humza's brother. Humza Taherany is who the Tenants listed on this T1/T2 application because he is the property owner and their Landlord. The Tenants testified that Hadi "played as landlord" and had some communications with the Tenants during the tenancy, but he was deflecting responsibility for their issues onto his real estate broker (Sean Chase at PSR Brokerage).
4. I note that the definition of "landlord" is broad in section 2 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'). A landlord includes "(a) the owner or a rental unit or any other person who permits occupancy of a rental unit, other than a tenant who occupies a rental unit in a residential complex and who permits another person to also occupy the unit or any part of the unit, (b) the heirs, assigns, personal representatives and successors in title of a person referred to in clause (a)".
5. In lawsuits at courts and in applications at tribunals, it is incumbent on the applicant or plaintiff to bring claims against the people they are pursuing as respondents or defendants. There is no authority or requirement that all potential people who could be sued, need to be.
6. The Tenants in this application chose to bring their application against the property owner Humza, and the PSR Brokerage of the real estate agent they dealt with throughout their specific complaints to this application. The Tenants received the T1/T2 Order and can only enforce it (if the stay is lifted) against the named respondents in the style of cause for this application.
7. Even though there may have been another application at the LTB where Hadi was named as a landlord, the fact remains that the Tenants chose not to pursue any action against Hadi in this application. Claimants often pursue claims against parties they feel are the most liable or have the ability to pay in the event of having to enforce a judgment or order. It may have made sense to list Hadi as a landlord in the companion T2 application. But it was the Tenants' prerogative to pursue this T1/T2 application against whomever they wanted, and to exclude some potential parties if they chose to do so.
8. Since the potential party's legal representative did not provide any evidence or authority for why Hadi should be added to the style of cause as a party/Respondent on this application, I find that on the preliminary issue, Hadi Teherany has not been established to be a party to this application.

Request to Review Denied

9. Since Hadi Teherany was not named by the Tenants/Applicants as a respondent to this T1/T2 application, it would make sense why the LTB did not serve the notice of hearing for the October 15, 2025 hearing on Hadi.
10. I find that the potential party did not have standing to receive a notice of hearing for the T1/T2 hearing, since he was not a listed respondent to the proceeding. As a result, the claim that Hadi Teherany was not reasonably able to participate is not proven.
11. The potential party's legal representative also argued that there was a serious error in the T1/T2 Order because the vacate date was wrong. She advised they have evidence the Tenants did not move out in August. She submitted that the move out date was critical to the issues claimed in the application and would have changed the result.
12. The representative was asked whether this was new evidence that was not available at the time of the October 15, 2025 hearing, or could not reasonably be obtained before the hearing. She was unable to answer those questions and deferred to her client's knowledge on the matter. I provided time for the matter to stand down to try to have the potential party sign into the review hearing.
13. Despite waiting for over 2 hours, the potential party did not call into the review hearing. His representative advised he is currently out west in a different time zone which is 3 hours behind Ontario. There was no reasonable explanation provided why after waiting over 2 hours, the potential party was still not calling into the review hearing. The 'virtual-first' format allows parties to call in from any time zone, as they frequently do from all parts of the world.
14. As the potential party did not call in, I only had the hearsay submission of his legal representative, who admitted to never meeting with the client and not being involved in the matter from the outset. She only referred to some vague submission that there was proof the Tenants did not move out on August 19, 2025 but had no witness to testify about it.
15. There was no reasonable explanation given why the potential party could not attend the review hearing despite having the wherewithal to hire a paralegal before the review hearing, who did attend from the start of the review hearing. There was no reasonable explanation why the evidence in their possession was not provided to the brother who is actually listed as a respondent to this application, and why that evidence was not presented at the October 15, 2025 hearing. Nor was there any submission why the actual named Landlords did not attend the T1/T2 hearing despite being sent notice of the hearing.
16. The request for review was not made by the actual names Landlords Humza Teherany or PSR Brokerage. Neither of them alleged they were not reasonably able to participate or that there was a serious error.
17. The potential party had no standing at the T1/T2 hearing, but he could have attended with his brother Humza as a witness and to give relevant testimony about the vacate date.

18. A request for review is not the appropriate forum to try to have a “do over” of the original hearing, or correct deficiencies in evidence which were available by the hearing date but was not presented to challenge an application at that time.
19. I am not satisfied that the potential party was not reasonably able to participate in the T1/T2 proceedings. It was not proven on a balance of probabilities that the potential party was even someone who was entitled to receive notice about the T1/T2 proceedings; nor was there any explanation why the potential party did not simply provide the evidence about the vacate date to his brother or the real estate agent to use in the proceeding, neither of which attended the hearing either.
20. Since it was not proven on a balance of probabilities that the potential party was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding, or that there was a serious error in the T1/T2 Order, the request to review is denied.

It is ordered that:

21. The request to review the T1/T2 Order LTB-T-040120-24 issued on December 12, 2025 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.
22. The review interim order LTB-T-040120-24-RV-IN issued on January 14, 2026 is cancelled.
23. The stay of order LTB-T-040120-24 is lifted immediately.

February 13, 2026
Date Issued

Michelle Tan
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.