



**Order under Section 30, 31, 130 & 135
Residential Tenancies Act, 2006**

Citation: Kulbacki v Sterling Karamar, 2026 ONLTB 18935

Date: 2026-03-06

File Number: LTB-T-084360-24

In the matter of: 105, 349 MARLAND AVE
OSHAWA ON L1J1X4

Between: Shane Kulbacki Tenant

And

Sterling Karamar Landlords
Cogir Real Estates

Shane Kulbacki (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Sterling Karamar and Cogir Real Estates (the 'Landlords') altered the locking system on a door giving entry to the rental unit or residential complex without giving the Tenant replacement keys, 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, and withheld or interfered with their vital services or care services and meals in a care home. (T2 Application)

The Tenant also applied for a reduction of the rent charged for the rental unit due to a reduction or discontinuance in services or facilities provided in respect of the rental unit or the residential complex. (T3 Application)

The Tenant further applied for an order determining that the Landlords collected or retained money illegally. (T1 Application)

The Tenant further applied for an order determining that the Landlords failed to meet the Landlords' maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act') or failed to comply with health, safety, housing or maintenance standards. (T6 Application)

This application was heard by videoconference on January 27, 2026.

The legal representative for Landlord Cogir Real Estates, Sylwia McArthur, and the Tenant attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. As explained below, the Tenant's application is dismissed. The Tenant filed numerous applications with the Board, and all the applications have been allotted a single file number. So, while this order will reflect that the Tenant's application is dismissed, it should be noted that this is in reference to all the applications filed by the Tenant under this file number.
2. This matter was previously scheduled for a case conference on April 14, 2025, and the matter was adjourned to be scheduled for a hearing. As per the adjournment sheet, the Board had informed the Tenant that their applications contained no dates, lacked details/reasons, and that their remedies were unclear. The Board also advised the Tenant that these issues may be raised as a preliminary issue at the scheduled hearing.
3. At the hearing, the legal representative raised a preliminary issue and argued that the Tenant's applications do not contain sufficient details and particulars for them to understand the allegations. The Tenant argued that he had filed voluminous evidence in support of his allegations with the Board, and as I understand it, his position is that the Landlords either know, or ought to know, the allegations against them. The Tenant also confirmed that he did not serve their evidence to the Landlords. The legal representative responded that the onus is on the Tenant to provide detailed particulars of the allegations on the applications, and that the respondents should not have to filter through the Tenant's evidence to understand his allegations.
4. Considering the submission of the parties, I found it appropriate to dismiss the Tenant's applications. I accepted the preliminary issue raised by the legal representative. The Tenant's applications lacked detailed particulars, such as dates/time, reasons, to put the Landlords on notice for them to know the case to be met.
5. In the T1, and T2 application, no details/reasons are provided, and thus the grounds formulating the basis of the applications could not be made out. In the T3 application, the Tenant wrote "*safety and maintenance issue*" and does not provide any details describing the service/facility that was discontinued/reduced. Further, no remedy is selected on this application. With respect to the T6 application, there was lack of detailed descriptions as to the maintenance issue; the date when the issues started; the date when the Tenant told the Landlords about each issue; and whether the maintenance issue had been resolved. Also, the remedies on both the T2 and T6 applications are vague and not clear.
6. The Tenant had been previously advised at the case conference of the details missing from their applications and did not take any reasonable steps to amend their applications. The Tenant also did not serve their evidence to the Landlords which further supported the fact that the Landlords were not aware of the claims against them. Even if the Tenant had provided their evidence to the Landlords, the purpose of evidence is to corroborate the allegations. Evidence does not constitute a substitution for lack of sufficient details on the applications. Detailed particulars on the applications are what governs the grounds on the applications. In the circumstances of the case, the Landlords could not be expected to reasonably respond due to the issues noted above.
7. For the above noted reasons, I found it appropriate to dismiss the Tenant's application.
8. This order contains all the reasons for my decision within it. No further reasons shall be issued.

It is ordered that:

1. The Tenant's application is dismissed.

March 6, 2026
Date Issued

Inderdeep Padda
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.