



Order under Section 30 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Jalil v Premier Reality Advisors, 2026 ONLTB 18537

Date: 2026-03-03

File Number: LTB-T-100903-24

In the matter of: 18, 425 RATHBURN RD E
MISSISSAUGA ON L4Z1H6

Between: Aamir Jalil Tenant

And

Premier Reality Advisors Landlord

Aamir Jalil (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Premier Reality Advisors (the 'Landlord') failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act') or failed to comply with health, safety, housing or maintenance standards.

This application was heard by videoconference on February 26, 2026.

The Landlord's Legal Representative, Kelly Hawkes, the Landlord's Agent Ben Burke, and the Tenant attended the hearing. The Tenant requested to speak to Tenant Duty Counsel prior to the start of this proceeding, however Duty Counsel was not available.

Determinations:

1. As explained below, the Tenant did not prove the allegations contained in the application on a balance of probabilities. Therefore, the application is dismissed.
2. The Landlord's Legal Representative submitted that the allegations contained in the Tenant's application lack sufficient detail and particulars.
3. The Landlord's Legal Representative submitted that the application should be dismissed as the Tenant has not provided sufficient details and particulars of allegations other than there was an issue with mice when he moved in on May 1, 2023, and the Tenant has moved out of the rental unit. Moreover, the Landlord has been put in the unfair situation of having to defend itself to an application containing allegations that the Landlord has no understanding of what the issues are other than generalities of the allegations that there were rodent/mice issues, nor the remedies sought by the Tenant. Accordingly, the Landlord's Representative submitted that the Tenant's T6 application should be dismissed.

Moreover, the Landlord's Legal Representative submitted that the Tenant's application does not disclose a reasonable cause of action.

4. Upon Board questioning on why the Tenant had not provided sufficient details, he testified that he could not afford private counsel, and he was a layperson.
5. The Board can assist parties by providing general information as needed, however the Board does not act as a legal representative for either party and consequently, it is the Applicant's, in this case the Tenant responsibility to ensure that the application is complete and in compliance with the Act. It was further noted to the Tenant that he could have contacted Tenant Duty Counsel whose contact information was listed on the Notice of Hearing for this herein proceeding. The Tenant did not seek to amend his application during the proceeding.
6. An application must provide sufficient detail to allow the opposing party to know the specific allegations being made so that the opposing party can be in a position to know the case that must be met.
7. MacDougall J. wrote in *Ball v. Metro Capital [2022] O.J. No. 5931* that, "Particulars should include, dates and times of the alleged offensive conduct together with a detailed description of the alleged conduct." While this case involved a notice of termination served to a tenant, I am of the view the general principle regarding the need for particular and details apply equally to Tenant application. In this leading case, the Court stated that the various purposes for requiring a party to provide reasons and details include the responding party's need "to know the specific allegations made so that they can be in a position to know the case that must be met; to decide whether to dispute the allegations made before the Tribunal; and to consider whether to stop the conduct or activity or correct the omission...."
8. The Landlord's Legal Representative submitted the allegations toward the Landlord are lacking any semblance of details of said issues being pleaded by the Tenant. Moreover, evidence uploaded to the Tribunals Ontario Portal by the Tenant was not introduced as evidence during the proceeding and hence did not provide sufficient particulars to support the Tenant's allegations in his application, which the Landlord's Legal Representative submitted was a general statement, and devoid of detail that simply there was an issue with mice.
9. I find the allegations in the Tenant's application are vague and lack any context in terms of details. Specifically, the "Reasons for filing this Application" section of the application instructs the applicant to describe what happened, the dates and times of the events, who caused the problem and the names and titles of all people involved, which the Tenant has not done in a way that the Landlord could properly comprehend the issues at hand.
10. On the T6 application there simply is a statement and description that the Tenant had a mice issue since moving into the rental unit, devoid of sufficient detail.

11. It is not for the Landlord or the Board to assist the Tenant in completing their application or correcting deficiencies. As with all applications before the Board, it is the applicant who must bring an application that meets minimum requirements. However, the undersigned noted to the Tenant if he chooses to bring another application he should seek out legal counsel whether privately or by contacting Tenant Duty Counsel, if the time limitations of the Act permit.
12. The Landlord's right to present a meaningful defence in a timely fashion must also be taken into consideration. The application does not contain sufficient details on the alleged grounds that would allow the matter to be fairly heard.
13. As a result, I am satisfied that the lack of details provided in the application were not sufficient for the Landlord to understand the case to be met to and to make a decision concerning whether or not to dispute the allegations at the hearing, and effectively would have experienced significant prejudice if expected to present a defence against unknown, generalized and unspecified allegations. Moreover, the Tenant did not seek an opportunity to amend said application and had not done so as of the date of this proceeding.
14. Accordingly, the Tenant's application is dismissed.
15. This order contains all of the reasons for the decision within it. No further reasons shall be issued.

It is ordered that:

1. The Tenant's T6 application is dismissed.

March 3, 2026
Date Issued

Panagiotis P. Roupas
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.