



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

File Number: LTB-T-061883-23-RV

In the matter of: 609, 555 ANAND PVT
OTTAWA ON K1V2R7

Between: Elias Nehme Tenant
Faten Nehme

And

2464865 Ontario inc. Landlord
2464865 Ontario inc.

Review Order

The term “Landlord” refers to all persons or companies identified as a Landlord and “Tenant” refers to all persons identified as a Tenant, within the order.

Elias Nehme and Faten Nehme (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that 2464865 Ontario inc. and 2464865 Ontario inc. (the 'Landlord') :

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- 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.
- This is the T2 application.

The Tenant also applied for an order determining the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* or failed to comply with health, safety, housing or maintenance standards. This is the T6 application.

These applications were resolved by order LTB-T-061883-23 issued on February 3, 2026 as a result of a hearing that took place on July 21, 2025 where all parties were in attendance.

On February 19, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. For the reasons that follow the request to review is denied and the order remains unchanged.

REQUEST TO REVIEW

2. The Tenant's request to review alleges the order contains serious errors and goes on to dispute the presiding adjudicator's findings of fact relating to the allegations of mice, rats, pigeons, heath, illegal entries.
3. The Board's Interpretation Guideline 8 provides insight regarding requests to review orders and states in part:

Serious error includes:

An error of jurisdiction. For example the order relies on the wrong section of the RTA or exceeds the LTB's powers. This issue need not have been raised in the original hearing;

A procedural error which raises issues of natural justice;

An unreasonable finding of fact on a material issue which would potentially change the result of the order;

New evidence which was unavailable at the time of the hearing and which is potentially determinative of one or more central issues in dispute;

An error in law. The LTB will not exercise its discretion to review an order interpreting the RTA unless the interpretation conflicts with a binding decision of the Courts or is clearly wrong and unreasonable; and ,

An unreasonable exercise of discretion which results in an order outside the usual range of remedies or results and where there are no reasons explaining the result.

4. It goes on to state:

A request to review based on an alleged error of fact must include specific details of the alleged error and explain how a different finding of fact would change the result.

The original hearing Member's findings of fact are entitled to considerable deference. A request will not be granted simply because the reviewing adjudicator might have come to a different conclusion about the evidence. Even where it finds a factual error the LTB may not exercise its discretion to review if the error is trivial, does not relate to a material issue in dispute or would not change the result.

5. Was it unreasonable to find the evidence inconclusive regarding the alleged illegal entry on December 29, 2022? I find it was not. I say this because the evidence before the presiding adjudicator was a bald assertion from the Tenant that there was an illegal entry on this day, denial from the Landlord and their agents, written communication presented

by the Tenant confirming no one entered the unit from the condominium management company and confirmation from the Tenant that sometimes they left the door unlocked.

6. With respect to the allegation of substantial interference and harassment and the lack of heat, the presiding adjudicator articulated clearly why she found the evidence to be insufficient and vague at paragraphs 20-29 of the order that is the subject of this review. I find her reasons to be sufficient and accurate based on the application filed before the Board.
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 and the request to review is denied.
8. This order contains all of the reasons for the decision within it. No further reasons shall be issued.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-T-061883-23 issued on February 3, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

February 23, 2026
Date Issued

Sonia Anwar-Ali
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.