



**Order under Section 89
Residential Tenancies Act, 2006**

File Number: LTB-L-068813-24

In the matter of: 1540 HUMMINGBIRD CRT
PICKERING ON L1V7H8

Between: HOSSEIN PAKBIN Landlord

And

CORY QUANDUK Former Tenant
JANNAH DESHEVY

HOSSEIN PAKBIN (the 'Landlord') applied for an order requiring CORY QUANDUK and JANNAH DESHEVY (the 'Former Tenant') to pay the Landlord's reasonable out-of-pocket costs that the Landlord incurred or will incur to repair or replace undue damage to property. The damage was caused wilfully or negligently by the Former Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Former Tenant permitted in the residential complex.

This application was heard by videoconference on December 15, 2025.

The Landlord and the 1st named Tenant Cory Quanduk attended the hearing.

Procedural History:

1. This application appeared before the Board on July 15, 2025, and adjourned at the Landlord's request.

Determinations:

1. As explained below, the Landlord did not prove the allegations contained in the application on a balance of probabilities. Therefore, the application is dismissed.
2. I am not satisfied that the Landlord served the Former Tenant with the application and Notice of Hearing using a method permitted in subsection 191(1.0.1) of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act') and Rule 3.3 of the LTB's Rules of Procedure.
3. I turn to Rule 3.3 states that:

"In addition to methods of service identified in the RTA a document may be served on a tenant or former tenant no longer in possession of a rental unit, by:

ii. if it can be proven that the contents actually came to the attention of the tenant or former tenant.”

4. I questioned the Landlord on whether service could be established and if the documents came to the attention of the Tenant Jannah DE Shevy. The Landlord state he “does not know where she is because they are fighting.”
5. I considered Rule 5.17 and Rule 21.8 of the Board’s Rules of Procedure in determining this was not a case that warranted an adjournment. The Landlord is required to exercise some diligence to ensure their application can proceed. In my view, this includes reading the application and the Notice of Hearing and complying with the service requirements or making a reasonable attempt to do so. Beyond merely claiming that they “do not know where she is,” the Landlord did not demonstrate that they made any effort to locate the tenants, nor did they provide any justification or description of attempted contact.
6. I also considered the prejudice to the Landlord in not adjourning the file, however, in my view, this prejudice is a result of the Landlord’s failure to act on the clear instructions contained in the application and the Notice of Hearing to serve the documents to the Former Tenants. Additionally, this matter was adjourned from July 2025, for the same issue of service. The Landlord could have attended the hearing prepared to demonstrate they had been diligent in trying to serve the Former Tenants and were likely to succeed if the matter was adjourned. This was not the case here. For these reasons, I did not find there was a reasonable basis to adjourn the file, and I dismissed the Landlord’s application because of a lack of service.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlord’s application is dismissed.

March 24, 2026
Date Issued

Anthony Bruno
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.