



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

**Citation:** Helu v Antonis, 2026 ONLTB 24843

**Date:** 2026-03-23

**File Number:** LTB-T-094998-24-RV

**In the matter of:** Basement, 406 O'Connor Dr  
Toronto ON M4J2W3

**Between:** Murat Helu Tenant

### **And**

Christos (Chriscos) Antonis Landlords  
Anastasia Antonis ( Tsiriotaki-Antonis)

### **Review Order**

Murat Helu (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Christos (Chriscos) Antonis and Anastasia Antonis ( Tsiriotaki-Antonis) (the 'Landlord'):

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- 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.
- withheld or interfered with their vital services or care services and meals in a care home.
- did not give the Tenant a written tenancy agreement for their care home unit or the agreement did not include information about care services and meals or the charges the Tenant agreed to pay for them.

This application was resolved by order LTB-T-094998-24 issued on March 12, 2026.

On March 13, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing. In determining this request, I reviewed the materials in the LTB's file.

### **Determinations:**

1. The review request submits that the Board Member seriously erred in dismissing the Tenant's application and that the Tenant was not afforded procedural fairness.

2. Divisional Court case *Ball v Metro Capital Management Inc. [2002] OJ No 5931*, requires an applicant to provide sufficient reason and details for the respondent party to know the case to be met. On review of the Board's records, the Tenant's T2 application is confusing and lacks particulars, more specifically, the application provides a confusing narrative of the allegations and lacks the dates of the alleged incidents that occurred.
3. Paragraphs 31 to 39 of the order provides sufficient reasons why the application was dismissed. On review of the Board's records, the Tenant was advised at the Adjudicative Case Conference held on June 12, 2025, that his application lacked details. Interim order LTB-T-094998-24-IN dated June 20, 2025 was issued providing the Tenant to July 21, 2025 to amend his application but failed to do so. In these circumstances, dismissing the application was reasonable.
4. Although the Tenant disagree with the March 12, 2026 order, the order sets out a reasonable basis for the determinations made. As stated in Guideline 8 of the Board's Interpretation Guidelines, the Member's findings of fact are entitled to considerable deference. Reasonable determinations will not be interfered with on review.
5. The Tenant's disagreement with the Member's determination is not sufficient grounds for review. There is nothing in the record to support a determination that the hearing Member applied improper principles in assessing the application filed with the Board to support its conclusion.
6. The review request also submits that the Tenant was not afforded procedural fairness by his own lack of knowledge of Board procedures. The review request states that the Tenant is not legally trained, has no experience with the Board's process and was left to navigate complex legal issues without assistance. This is not a sufficient ground for review and is not an error of the Board. Parties are presumed to be familiar with the Board's basic processes, such as filing evidence and providing details in an application. Any party that has such a lack of familiarity with the Board's process that their ability to participate in the proceedings is impaired should obtain legal advice or representation. The Tenant did not obtain legal advice or representation. Paragraph 28 of the order further confirms that the Tenant declined to speak with Tenant Duty Counsel on the date of the hearing.
7. The review request further alleges that the Member demonstrated bias by not providing the Tenant with an opportunity to present his case, clarify evidence, or respond to the allegations. Paragraph 23 of the order sets out the Tenant's submissions with respect to his failure to amend the application. I am satisfied that the Tenant was afforded procedural fairness and had a meaningful opportunity to participate. Disagreement with the outcome does not establish bias.
8. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order or that a serious error occurred in the proceedings or that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.

**It is ordered that:**

1. The request to review order LTB-T-094998-24 issued on March 12, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

**March 23, 2026**  
**Date Issued**

---

**Mayra Sawicki**  
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.