



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

Citation: MZ Investments Inc v Miftari, 2026 ONLTB 23755

Date: 2026-03-20

File Number: LTB-L-097610-25-RV

In the matter of: 3, 12 Holton Ave N
Hamilton ON L8L6H4

Between:	MZ Investments Inc	Landlord
	and	
	Liridona Miftari	Tenant

Review Order

MZ Investments Inc (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Liridona Miftari (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-097610-25 issued on January 30, 2026.

On February 11, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order and that the order be stayed until the request to review the order is resolved.

On March 11, 2026, interim order LTB-L-097610-25-RV-IN was issued, staying the order issued on January 30, 2026.

The review request was heard by videoconference on March 16, 2026.

The Landlord's Legal Representative, Jessica Travers, and the Tenant attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. On the basis of the submissions made, I am not satisfied that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. Accordingly, the Tenant's request to review must be denied.
2. The Tenant testified that she was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding because she did not receive the Notice of Hearing or otherwise have the login details to log onto the hearing. She testified that on December 11, 2025, the property manager sent her an email informing her that the hearing had been scheduled for January 29, 2026 and that she would receive the actual copy of the Notice of Hearing in the mail or by email. She testified that she forgot to follow-up on it when she didn't receive the notice of hearing.

3. The Tenant was aware of the hearing but failed to take any steps to diarize the date of the hearing or follow-up with the Landlord when she did not receive the login details, despite being aware that the hearing date was approaching. It is reasonable to expect that if a party was aware of a proceeding but needed more information, they would have reached out to, at the very least, the party that informed them and request that information.
4. The Courts have affirmed that parties to a Board application are required to exercise due diligence to prepare for a Board hearing: *Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs'ka*, [2017] O.J. No. 4863 (Div. Ct.), paragraph 8, which states:

If parties are not diligent in dealing with legal proceedings then they cannot demand that a Tribunal waste its resources by rehearing matters a second time. To allow this would undermine the ability of the administration of justice to deliver timely, cost-effective and final orders.

5. Based on the evidence adduced at the hearing, I find that the Tenant had a reasonable opportunity to participate and did not exercise due diligence or chose not to attend the hearing. Therefore, the request to review based on the Tenant's allegation that she was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing is denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-097610-25 issued on January 30, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.
2. The interim order issued on March 11, 2026 is cancelled. The stay of order LTB-L-097610-25 is lifted immediately.

March 20, 2026
Date Issued

Candace Aboussafy
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.