



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

Citation: Sidhu v Clement, 2026 ONLTB 16495

Date: 2026-02-23

File Number: LTB-L-081302-25-RV

In the matter of: 3, 1463 O'CONNOR DR
Toronto ON M4B2V5

Between: Harjeetpal Singh Sidhu Landlord
Harsimran Kaur Randhawa

And

Dwight Ezra J Clement Tenant

Review Order

Harjeetpal Singh Sidhu and Harsimran Kaur Randhawa (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Dwight Ezra J Clement (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-081302-25 issued on December 19, 2025.

On February 18, 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. The Tenant submits that the hearing was not procedurally fair because the member seriously erred by misconstrued his evidence about his income, erred by determining \$550.00 is all the Tenant can pay, erred by misconstruing his ODSP repayment plan and not googling the information, and erred by not considering the circumstances when postponing eviction 31 days.
2. It is clear from the review request that the Tenant does not agree with the decision under review. However, I am not satisfied the hearing was not procedurally unfair. The Tenant was provided opportunity to make full submissions and give evidence as to his income, expenses and circumstances, and engaged fully in the hearing process.
3. Regarding the Tenant's income, the order is an accurate reflection of the evidence at the hearing. The number of income payments the Tenant receives does not alter the finding

that the Tenant made no payment prior to the hearing. That fact would not materially change the result of the order.

4. The finding that the Tenant requested a payment plan of \$550.00 and would not pay more is not unreasonable. The Tenant was adamant at the hearing that he did not want to pay more. A more appropriate payment plan was canvassed by the member but the Tenant refused that option. The Tenant was given sufficient time to provide submissions, present evidence and an appropriate plan.
5. There is no error in the member's determination that a postponement of eviction by 40 days is not unfair. The member's determination is reasonable given the evidence presented at the hearing. The recording and the order demonstrate that the circumstances of both parties were considered. The order sets out detailed reasons for the determinations made by the member and establishes a reasonable basis for those determinations.
6. The exercise of discretion is entitled to deference and reasonable determinations will not be interfered with on review. There is nothing in the record to support a determination that the hearing member applied improper principles in assessing the evidence introduced or that there was insufficient evidence before the Board to support its conclusions.
7. 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.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-081302-25 issued on December 19, 2025 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

February 23, 2026
Date Issued

Julie Broderick
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.