



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

File Number: LTB-L-097900-25-RV2
LTB-T-090638-25-RV2
LTB-T-097353-25-RV2
LTB-L-097932-25-RV2
LTB-T-090667-25-RV2
LTB-T-097354-25-RV2

In the matter of: MAIN UNIT & LOWER UNIT 3699 HOLDEN CRES
MISSISSAUGA ON L5A2V9

Between: LIUDMILA VALCARCEL SILVA Landlord
FRANCISCO MEJIAS ROGERS

And

STEFANO CASERTA Tenant
NATALIE REMO
HENRIQUE D AVILA
SANDRA ACOSTA

Review Order

The Landlord applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict the Tenants because the Tenants did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes. **LTB-L-097900-25 and LTB-L-097932-25.**

The Tenants applied for an order determining that 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. **LTB-T-090638-25 AND LTB-T-090667-25**
- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenant or by a member of the Tenant's household.
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant. **LTB-T-097354-25 AND LTB-T-097353-25**

These applications were scheduled before the Board on February 2, 2026 where it was adjourned due to insufficient time in the hearing block.

On February 6, 2026, interim order LTB-L-097900-25-IN was issued; on February 26, 2026 the Tenant filed a request to review of the interim order issued on February 6, 2026 which was addressed in order LTB-L-097900-25-IN-RV issued on March 2, 2026.

On March 2, 2026 the Tenant made a request to pay into the Board which was addressed in the endorsement issued on March 4, 2026, among other requests.

On March 5, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the endorsement.

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

Determinations:

1. For the reasons that follow the request to review the endorsement issued on March 4, 2026 is denied. The endorsement remains unchanged.

REQUEST TO REVIEW

2. The Tenant's request to review alleges he was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding, however, there was no proceeding that resulted in the issuance of the endorsement. In fact, it was his request to pay into the Board and to combine the applications that resulted in the issuance so under these circumstances I cannot find that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate.
3. It appears that the Tenant seeks that the Board reconsider the denial of his request to pay into the Board and the Board's decision to hear the Tenant applications together and separate from the Landlord's applications.
4. The problem with the Tenant's request is that the purpose of a review process is not to ask for a reconsideration but rather to demonstrate a serious error has occurred or that a party was not reasonably able to participate in a proceeding.
5. So the question before me is whether it was unreasonable for the Member to deny the request to pay into the Board and to separate the Tenant's applications from the Landlord's.
6. With respect to the request to pay into the Board as articulated in the endorsement, the Board's Interpretation Guideline #2 speaks to where it would be appropriate to grant such a request and states:

The tenant will have to satisfy the Board that special circumstances exist that justify the payment in of rent. Special circumstances may include: where the tenant does not know who to pay or how to contact the landlord; the landlord refuses to accept the rent; or where the tenancy will be terminated and it may be

difficult for the tenant to enforce the order. There may be other factors and circumstances to consider.

7. Based on the submissions and reasons articulated in the endorsement, I do not find the denial of the request to pay into the Board to be unreasonable. Here, the Tenant is aware of who their landlords are, has their contact information and there is no evidence before the Board that the payments being refused by the Landlord. The Tenant submits the marital status of the Landlords has changed – and though that may be true - it is unclear how this change could impact the Tenant's ability to pay the rent. The Tenant takes the position that it is unclear who the rent needs to be paid to – however, in the absence of any direction from the Landlord about any change, everything remains status quo. So the request to review this decision is denied.
8. With respect to the Tenant's disagreement with the Board's decision to schedule the Tenant applications together and the Landlord's applications together, once again, this is a discretionary decision that is entitled to deference. In reviewing the reasoning by the Member, I find it is within the normal range of outcomes and so the request to review for this reason is also denied.
9. Aside from having the same parties, same address and the potential for a rent abatement on the Tenant's applications, there is nothing on the record to suggest that the matters are so interrelated and require their joinder. If the Tenant's concern is related to offsetting arrears from what they owe, this can be raised and requested at the hearing.
10. 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 the endorsement LTB-L-097900-25 et al issued on March 4, 2026 is denied. The endorsement is confirmed and remains unchanged.

March 10, 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.