



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

Citation: Laurel Wind Investments Inc v Bright, 2026 ONLTB 16550

Date: 2026-02-19

File Number: LTB-L-101021-25-RV

In the matter of: 424 10TH AVE
HANOVER ON N4N2N9

Between: Laurel Wind Investments Inc Landlord

And

Joanne Bright Tenant
Zachary Bright

Review Order

Laurel Wind Investments Inc (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Joanne Bright and Zachary Bright (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-101021-25 issued on February 9, 2026.

On February 18, 2026, the Tenant Zachary Bright requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing.

Determinations:

1. Neither Tenants attended the hearing that occurred on February 5, 2026. The Tenant Zachary Bright states the following in the review request:

"I was unable to attend the original hearing due to health reasons, including managing personal medical matters that prevented me from appearing.

I was actively addressing these urgent health issues and was therefore not able to respond in time to the ex parte order.

...

I unfortunately was not able to be present for the last hearing, due to medical/health issues I've been facing the last several months"

2. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
3. In *So v. Canadian Mental Health Association, Toronto Branch*, 2024 ONSC 3371 (Div. Ct.) (CanLII), the Divisional Court affirmed that a person who requests a review of an order must give “sufficient information to support a preliminary finding of an alleged serious error or an explanation why the requestor was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing”, per Rule 26.8 of the Board’s Rules of Procedure. In this case the Tenant has not done so. The Tenant vaguely mentions health reasons but provides no further details.
4. The Divisional Court in *Wang v. Oloo*, 2023 ONSC 1028 (‘Wang’) considered the information required from a doctor’s note to support a finding that an adjournment was necessary. While this case involves a request for review not an adjournment request, I find *Wang* informative about the type of information required about a medical condition to support a finding that someone cannot participate in a hearing. The Court states that doctor’s notes must contain sufficient information to enable the court to exercise its own judgment as to whether the adjournment should be granted. The Court elaborates that this at a minimum should include a description of a diagnosis, the effect of the patient’s condition on their ability to attend and participate in the hearing, and a statement as to when, in the doctor’s opinion, the patient will be well enough to attend court and participate as required. In this case the Tenant has not provided a doctor’s note nor provided any of the information identified as being required by the Court in *Wang*.
5. The Tenant describes the medical condition both as urgent and that he has been facing it for the last several months. The Tenant has provided insufficient information to explain why he could not request an adjournment or to reschedule in advance. The Divisional Court has repeatedly affirmed that parties to an application are required to follow the Board’s process to reschedule or adjourn a hearing: *Lacroix v. Central-McKinlay International Ltd.*, 2022 ONSC 2807; *Wang v. Oloo*, 2023 ONSC 1028.
6. With the limited and vague information provided in the request I am unable to determine if the Tenant exercised due diligence to attend the hearing. In *Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs’ka*, 2017 ONSC 5541 (CanLII) the Court stated:

“Lack of diligence in dealing with court proceedings is a reason for refusing to set aside an order where a party has failed to appear. In other words, it was not an error in law for the Review Board to find that lack of diligence constituted a reason not to grant the landlord a rehearing. If parties are not diligent in dealing with legal proceedings then they cannot demand that a Tribunal waste its resources by rehearing matters a second time. To allow this would undermine the ability of the administration of justice to deliver timely, cost-effective and final orders”.
7. The review request provides no information about why the other Tenant did not attend the hearing.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-101021-25 issued on February 9, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

February 19, 2026
Date Issued

Amanda Kovats
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.