



Order under Section 135 / 57 / 30 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Edgar v Sterling Karamar, 2026 ONLTB 25485

Date: 2026-03-31

File Number: LTB-T-022063-25

In the matter of: 209, 12 GOLDFINCH COURT
NORTH YORK ON M2R2C4

Between: Alexander Edgar Tenant

And

Sterling Karamar Landlord

Alexander Edgar (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Sterling Karamar (the 'Landlord')

- collected or retained money illegally (T1 Application)
- gave a notice of termination in bad faith (T5 Application)
- 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 March 23, 2026.

The Landlord's Representative, Mark Ciobotaru, and the Tenant attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. The Tenant filed the application on March 14, 2025. At the Adjudicative Case Conference on August 6, 2025, the matter was adjourned because the Tenant requested to amend their applications to include the minimum information for the claims that would be necessary in order to proceed, and an interim order was issued as a result.
2. The interim order LTB-T-022063-25-IN, dated August 12, 2025, provided clear direction to the Tenant to file any amendments to the applications, and specifically include dates, details of incidents, rent amounts, and any evidence that they would be relying on at the hearing by September 30, 2025. The interim order further provided information and steps about amending the application, as well as instructions with respect to submitting evidence to the LTB and the Landlord.

3. The Tenant filed some documents on September 30, 2025. However, the documents did not comply with the interim order and failed to include any specific details or dates.
4. At the hearing, the Landlord's representative submitted that the allegations contained in the applications remained unclear and that the Landlord has been put in the unfair position of having to respond to applications containing allegations that the Landlord has no understanding of what the issues are, and no clear dates were included. In addition, the Tenant has been given ample time to correct his application as this is the second time the parties have been before the Board. He also noted that at the ACC on August 6, 2025, the member took more time to fully explain the deficiencies with the applications and the necessary amendments to be made in order to proceed with the applications. Accordingly, the Landlord's representative submitted that the Tenant's T1, T5, and T6 applications should be dismissed.
5. The Tenant admitted that he received the interim order and testified that all of the necessary information has been filed with the LTB, although the Tenant was not able to refer to any specific document filed with the LTB to provide clear dates and clarify the issues in the applications.
6. Further, with respect to the Tenant's T5 application for bad faith, the Tenant testified that he did not receive an N12 or N13 notice, or equivalent document that could be considered to be a notice of termination, from the Landlord. I note that this issue was also mentioned to be addressed in the interim order.

Analysis

7. Applications must provide sufficient detail to allow the opposing party to know the specific allegations being made so that the responding party can be in a position to know the case that must be met and determine whether to raise a defence.
8. Administrative tribunals are bound by the duty of fairness, and the duty of procedural fairness includes the right of a party to know the case they have to meet. Natural justice and procedural fairness require nothing less. Absent this the right to a fair hearing is denied.
9. In the matter before me, the applications were not only unclear as to what issues the Tenant had raised, but did not contain sufficient information to provide any detail to the Landlord to understand the claim being made with clear indication of the dates of the alleged events, even after the Tenant was provided the opportunity to amend their application to provide this detail. I note that, the matter was adjourned previously specifically to provide the Tenant with the opportunity to amend the application to include further information and clarity.
10. Having reviewed the materials filed by the Tenant, I am satisfied that the level of detail provided in the applications were not sufficient for the Landlord to understand the case to be met and to defend, if they chose to do so. I also find that the Tenant has been given sufficient time to amend the applications, along with clear information on what was required for the matter to proceed. As such, the Tenant's T1 and T6 applications will be dismissed.

11. Based on the Tenant's own admission that they were not served the N12 or N13 notice from the Landlord, or an equivalent document that could be determined to be a notice of termination, the T5 application must also be dismissed as they have failed to meet the requirements of section 57 of the Act.

It is ordered that:

1. The Tenant's applications are dismissed.

March 31, 2026
Date Issued

Colette Myers
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.

