



Order under Sections 30 & 31 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Schwartz v 2103286 Ontario Inc, 2026 ONLTB 20806

Date: 2026-03-12

File Number: LTB-T-050927-22

LTB-T-062591-22

In the matter of: 2, 14 ST ANDREW STREET
TORONTO ONTARIO M5T1K6

Between: Mark Schwartz Tenant

And

2103286 Ontario Inc. Landlords
Behzad Hosseinpour

Mark Schwartz (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that 2103286 Ontario Inc. and Behzad Hosseinpour (the 'Landlords') 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. (T6 Application)

Mark Schwartz (the 'Tenant') also applied for an order determining that Behzad Hosseinpour and 2103286 Ontario Inc. (the 'Landlords') have entered the rental unit illegally and substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit and harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant. (T2 application)

This application was heard by videoconference on January 5, 2026.

The Landlord Behzard Hosseinpour and the Tenant attended the hearing.

All references in this order to Landlord in the singular relate to Behzard Hosseinpour.

Determinations:

Preliminary Issue: Adjournment Request

1. At the commencement of the hearing the Tenant requested an adjournment of the matter as he had retained a paralegal to represent him on his matter in December, but after

providing his paralegal with his evidence they declined to represent him on these matters. Since that time due to the Christmas holidays he has been unable to retain alternative representation.

2. The Tenant stated that he is a senior and sometimes has memory and cognitive issues and would benefit from the assistance of a legal representative. In addition they can assist with legal nuances.
3. The Landlords were opposed to the adjournment request, as the Tenant's applications have been going on since 2022, and the Tenant has had a number of different legal representatives since the matters were commenced.
4. Under Section 10 of the *Statutory Powers and Procedures Act, 1990* (the 'SPPA') a right to representation is not absolute.
5. The test for an adjournment is set out in Rule 21.8 of the LTB's Rules of Procedure:

A CMH or hearing may be adjourned at the discretion of a Hearing Officer or Member where satisfied that an adjournment is required to permit an adequate hearing to be held. Relevant factors the LTB may consider in deciding the request include:

- a. the reason for the adjournment and position of the parties;
- b. the issues in the application;
- c. any prejudice that may result from granting or denying the request;
- d. the history of the proceeding including other adjournments or rescheduling; and
- e. the LTB's obligation to adopt the most expeditious method of determining the questions arising in a proceeding that affords to all persons directly affected by the proceeding an adequate opportunity to know the issues and be heard on the matter

6. The Board's Interpretation Guideline 1 states:

Parties should assume that the hearing will proceed on the date stated in the Notice of Hearing. This means that the parties should be prepared to present their evidence, call and question witnesses and make submissions.

...

Where the Member is satisfied that the party has received sufficient notice of the hearing and has been provided with an adequate opportunity to prepare their evidence and submissions, summons witnesses and obtain counsel ahead of the hearing date, an adjournment is not usually granted unless there are exceptional circumstances.

The specific factors the Member may consider in deciding whether to grant an adjournment include:

1. the reason for the adjournment and position of the parties;
2. the issues in the application;
3. any prejudice that may result from granting or denying the request;
4. the history of the proceeding including other adjournments or rescheduling;

5. the LTB's obligation to adopt the most expeditious method of determining the questions arising in a proceeding that affords to all persons directly affected by the proceeding an adequate opportunity to know the issues and be heard on the matter.
7. Having considered the circumstances and submissions of the parties and the reason for the adjournment request in conjunction with the Board's Rule 21.8 and its Guideline¹, the Tenant's request to adjourn the matters is denied.

Preliminary Issue: Amendments to Applications

8. At the commencement of the hearing the Landlords raised the preliminary issue regarding numerous amended applications being filed by the Tenant in contravention to an interim order previously issued by the Board. The Landlord sought clarification as to which application and issues the Tenant would be permitted to proceed on.

T6 Application Amendments

9. On February 8, 2024 an interim order was issued relating to the Tenant's T6 application (LTB-T-050927-22), which orders at paragraph 4:

On or before February 29, 2024, the Tenant will serve to the Landlord by email and file with the Board an amended T6 application. The Tenant shall not add any new allegations to the amended T6. The Tenant shall only make amendments to the issues already present on the original application. The amendments are to include the following:

- a) For the issues already stated in the Tenant's application, the Tenant is to include the date the Tenant became aware of the issue, when and how the Landlords were made aware of the issue, if the issue was resolved the date on which it was resolved, and the impact the issues had on the Tenant.
 - b) The Tenant is also to include the requested remedy of rent abatement and how the Tenant quantifies the amount requested. Quantifying the rent abatement will be in relation to only the issues already claimed in the original T6 application.
10. The interim order indicates that if the Tenant does not comply with the February 29, 2024 deadline the Member at the hearing may refuse to accept the Tenant's amended application.
 11. Although an amended application was not filed in the portal prior to February 29, 2024 the Tenant did provide an email with the attachments dated February 29, 2024 at 8:27 PM including an amended T6 Application that was sent to LTB.Evidence@ontario.ca and the Landlord.
 12. In addition to the amended T6 application the email also included a chart listing the Tenant's issues, the date the Tenant became aware of the issue, when and how the

Landlords were made aware of the issue, if the issue was resolved the date on which it was resolved, and the impact the issues had on the Tenant. I find that this email complied with the filing requirements of the interim order, subject to the following.

13. Pursuant to the interim order the Tenant may proceed with their amended T6 application and accompanying chart served and filed on February 29, 2024, only with respect to the following issues that were raised in the Tenants original T6 application, no other issues raised in the amendments may proceed:
 - a) Request to remove the fuse box from neighbour's room;
 - b) Full building and fire safety report;
 - c) Restore gas oven to working condition; and
 - d) Inspection of ventilation hood over stove.

T2 Application Amendments

14. On April 9, 2024 an interim order was issued relating to the Tenant's T2 application (LTB-T-062591-22), which orders at paragraph 3.

If the Tenant wishes to request to amend their application prior to the hearing, then on or before April 20, 2024, the Tenant shall serve a copy of their amended application to the Landlord and shall file a certificate of service with the LTB confirming that the Landlord was served, in accordance with Rule 15 of the LTB's Rules of Procedure. The request to amend will be decided at the hearing.

15. Pursuant to the interim order the Tenant may proceed with their amended T2 application that was served on the Landlord and filed with the Board on April 20, 2024, as it complies with the interim order.

Background

16. The residential complex consists of four bedrooms which share a common kitchen and washroom. There is also second kitchen and washroom in the residential complex used by another tenant.
17. The Tenant's tenancy began on March 1, 2016 where he rented a bedroom from the Landlord at the residential complex. The tenancy ended when the Tenant and the Landlords mutually agreed to end the tenancy with the tenant vacating the rental unit in September 2023.
18. Initially there were 4 tenants residing in the residential complex, but at the time the Tenant vacated the rental unit there was only one other tenant.

T6 Application

19. The Tenant's T6 application alleges that the Landlords failed to meet their maintenance obligations with respect to the following issues:
 - a) Request to remove the fuse box from neighbour's room;

- b) Full building and fire safety report;
 - c) Restore gas oven to working condition; and
 - d) Inspection of ventilation hood over stove.
20. Pursuant to 20(1) of the Act a landlord is responsible for providing and maintaining a residential complex, including the rental units in it, in a good state of repair and fit for habitation and for complying with health, safety, housing and maintenance standards.
21. In *Onyskiw v. CJM Property Management Ltd.*, 2016 ONCA 477, ("*Onyskiw*") the Court of Appeal held that the LTB should take a contextual approach and consider the entirety of the factual situation in determining whether there was a breach of the landlord's maintenance obligations, including whether the landlord responded to the maintenance issue reasonably in the circumstances. The court rejected the submission that a landlord is automatically in breach of its maintenance obligation as soon as an interruption in service occurs.

Request to remove fuse box from neighbour's room

22. At the hearing the Tenant indicated that he was no longer pursuing this issue as part of his T6 application. As such the Tenant's claim relating to the fuse box is dismissed.

Request for Fire Safety and Building Report

23. The Tenant states that he wanted a Fire Safety Report and Building Report for his own piece of mind living in the building.
24. The Landlord states that the Tenant did not request these items from him and that the Tenant on his own arranged to have a fire inspection conducted at the property on June 9, 2022 and that he was provided with a copy of the report from that inspection.
25. The request for a Fire Safety Report and Building Report are not maintenance issues contemplated under section 20 of the Act. I am not satisfied that the Landlords have breached their obligations under the Act and even if this were to be required, which I find that it is not, the Tenant did not dispute that he obtained a report in 2022, the year that this application was originally filed; the issue is now moot. This portion of the T6 application is dismissed.

Restore Gas Stove to working order

26. The Tenant claims the oven portion of the stove was not functioning since the time he moved into the rental unit. The Tenant notified the Landlords of the issue with the oven on May 18, 2022 after the Tenant had the City of Toronto Property Standards attend the residential complex.
27. The Tenant states that a Property Standards Order was issued to the Landlords on May 19, 2022 and required the stove to be repaired to working condition by June 23, 2022.

28. The Landlord states that the issue with the stove resolved on June 28, 2022 when the entire stove was replaced. The Landlord provided an email that he states is from the By-law Officer who issued the Property Standards Order on May 19, 2022 indicating that the file had been closed. The Landlord testified that the Tenant tampered with the stove after it was repaired which resulted in a second Property Standards Order being issued.
29. A subsequent Property Standards Order was issued to the Landlord on August 15, 2022 which again required the stove to be repaired to working condition September 16, 2022.
30. The Landlords appealed the Property Standard Order and a hearing occurred on December 12, 2022. The written decision of the Property Standards Committee was released on May 17, 2023 which confirmed the requirement of the Landlords to have the stove in working condition.
31. The Tenant states that the issue was resolved in May 2023.
32. It is undisputed that the Tenant into the unit in 2016 and had no complaints about the stove for six years until May 18, 2022 when the issue was brought to his attention
33. The Landlord states that the Tenant only raised the issue of the stove on May 18, 2022 and filed an application with the Board on May 21, 2022 only three days later for maintenance issues relating to the stove.
34. Additionally, the Landlord states that there was a second kitchen within the residential complex with an oven that the Tenant had access to.

Analysis

35. Based on the evidence before me I am satisfied that the stove was in a state of disrepair and not functioning. Two (2) property standards orders were issued to the Landlords, one on May 19, 2022 and the other on August 15, 2022 requiring the Landlords to have a stove in working order. I am satisfied that the Landlords did not address the issue in a timely manner, until after his appeal of the second property standards order was denied on May 17, 2023. There was no evidence to support the Landlord's assertion that the stove was initially fixed and then tampered with by the Tenant. On a balance of probabilities, I find that the Landlords breached its obligations under section 20(1) of the Act with respect to this issue for the period of May 19, 2022 to some time in May 2023.

Inspection of ventilation hood above stove

36. The Tenant produced no evidence at the hearing with respect to an issue with the ventilation hood above the stove. As such, this portion of the T6 application is dismissed.

Remedies

37. The Tenant seeks a rent abatement of 50% per month for a period of 8 months for the disrepair of the stove. The Tenant's monthly rent is \$750.00. A 50% rent abatement for a period of 8 months equates to \$3,000.00

38. The Tenant admits that they did not raise the issue of the stove for the first six years of the tenancy as they had use of the stove top, not the oven portion. The Tenant stated that had he had access to an oven he would have baked more of his food which is healthier than frying, which he had been doing on the stove top.
39. In the circumstances I believe a rent abatement of \$50.00 per month, for the loss of the use of the stove, for a period of 8 months is appropriate equating to \$400.00. I find that the Tenant did not advise the Landlord of the issues with the stove until they requested the inspection and the stove was finally repaired on May 17, 2023.
40. The Tenant is also entitled to their costs of this application in the amount of \$53.00

T2 Application

41. The Tenant applied for an order determining that the Landlords:

- 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.
- Entered the rental unit illegally.

Substantial interference and harassment

42. On April 1, 2022 the Landlord accompanied by two police officers were attempting to evict another tenant and the Tenant began filming the incident. The Tenant claims that the Landlord threatened to evict him if he continued to film the event.
43. The Tenant testified that on August 1, 2022 the Landlord indicated that he wanted to move into the rental property and move a fridge from its current location into the kitchen area and was assessing the area. The Tenant had numerous bottles of water stored in a box in the kitchen, where the Landlord wanted to move the fridge. The Landlord wanted the box moved and proceeded to empty the Tenant's water bottles and touch the Tenant's dishes.
44. The Tenant states that in September the Landlord offered to pay the Tenant to move out of the rental unit, because the Landlord stated that he needed the Tenant's room.
45. The Tenant testified that in February the Landlord's representative stopped providing rent receipts, so the Tenant paid rent via e-transfer so that he had a record that rent was paid.
46. On February 1, 2023 the Landlord sent an email to the Tenant indicating that the Tenant had to move out all of his personal belongings from the room, kitchen and bathroom. The email goes on to say that the Tenant can't share the place with the Landlord anymore.
47. On February 2, 2023 the Landlord sent another email to the Tenant indicating that this is a final notice, that the Tenant was to remove all his stuff immediately.
48. On February 3, 2023 the Landlord sent further emails to the Tenant indicating that the Tenant shares a kitchen and bathroom with the Landlord and he is not protected under the RTA and that this is a final notice to remove all items from the residential complex.

49. On February 25, 2023 the Landlord sent another email to the Tenant indicating that the Tenant had to move out and remove his items from the kitchen and bathroom by the end of the month.
50. The Landlord sent additional emails on March 13, 18, 28, 29, 2023 to the Tenant telling him he was required to move out of the rental unit.
51. The Tenant stated that police attended the residential complex as a result of a call placed by the Landlord regarding the Tenant on March 29, 2023, but upon attendance the Police declined to deal with the issue indicating that it was an issue for the Landlord and Tenant Board.
52. On April 19, 2023 the Tenant received a letter from a paralegal indicating that the Landlord has asked him to leave the property since August 2022 and that he shares a bathroom and kitchen with the Landlord and is therefore not protected under the *Residential Tenancies Act*. The Letter states that the Tenant was trespassing and that he was prohibited from attending or remaining at the rental unit as of April 24, 2023.
53. The Tenant testified that the Landlord lives in Thornhill with his wife and kids and did not reside or stay overnight in the residential complex, but did move some items into one of the bedrooms in late February or March of 2023 after another tenant vacated.
54. The Landlord testified that he purchased the property in 2007 and was residing in the residential complex in 2016 when the Tenant moved in. The Landlord and Tenant entered into a one page agreement whereby it states that the Tenant would be sharing a bathroom and kitchen with the Landlord.
55. The Landlord moved out of the rental unit in 2018, but states that he moved back into the rental unit at some point in February of 2023.
56. At a hearing on an unrelated matter commenced by the Landlord relying on the application of the Act to this tenancy the parties agreed to a consent order issued on May 17, 2023 terminating the tenancy effective September 1, 2023.

Does the Act Apply

57. The Landlord denies that he was harassing the Tenant and substantially interfering with his reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex and further states that as he was residing in the residential complex along with the Tenant and they shared a washroom and kitchen, the tenancy is exempt from the Act pursuant to Section 5(i).
58. Section 5(i) of the Acts states the following:

This Act does not apply with respect to,

(i) living accommodation whose occupant or occupants are required to share a bathroom or kitchen facility with the owner, the owner's spouse, child or parent or the spouse's child or parent, and where the owner, spouse, child or parent lives in the building in which the living accommodation is located;

59. The Landlord produced a driver's licence showing the residential complex as his address as well as a cellphone bill, dated March 31, 2023 and a letter from Ontario Health, dated February 3, 2023, which also indicated his address was the residential complex, as well as a video whereby the Landlord had access to one of the bedrooms in the rental unit.
60. Of note the Landlord's driver's licence has an issuance date of March 24, 2022 a full year before he states he resided in the residential complex. I find that the fact that the Landlord may be using the residential address for mailing purposes is not determinative that the Landlord resides in the residential complex.
61. Additionally, at an adjudicative case conference held by the Board on January 18, 2024, the Landlord testified and it is reflected in the interim order issued February 8, 2024, that he has not resided in the residential unit since sometime in 2018. Had the Landlord again resided in the residential unit since February of 2023 one would have expected the Landlord to indicate that at the adjudicative case conference.
62. Furthermore, on May 3, 2023 the parties came before the Board on an application filed by the Landlord relying on the application of this act to the tenancy and there was no dispute that the Act applied and the parties entered into a consent order whereby the Tenant would pay rent for June, July and August and that the tenancy would end effective September 1, 2023.
63. In consideration of all the evidence before me I am satisfied on a balance of probabilities that the Act applies and that the Landlord did not move back into the residential complex in February 2023 as he stated. It is the Landlord's burden of proof to establish that an exemption to the Act applies. I find that the Landlord's evidence to the Board was inconsistent and contradictory; prior to now he has consistently acknowledged, and asked that that Board find, that the tenancy is subject to the Act. As a result, I find the Tenant's evidence to be more credible and that the Tenant was not required to share a kitchen or bathroom with the Landlord. The Landlord has failed to establish that the exemption applies. As such, section 5(i) of the Act would not apply, the tenancy is subject to the Act.

Analysis of Substantial interference and harassment

64. Substantial Interference - Section 22 of the Act States:

A landlord shall not at any time during a tenant's occupancy of a rental unit and before the day on which an order evicting the tenant is executed substantially interfere with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or the residential complex in which it is located for all usual purposes by a tenant or members of his or her household.

65. Harassment – Section 23 of the Act States:

A landlord shall not harass, obstruct, coerce, threaten or interfere with a tenant.

66. Having determined that the Act applies to the application before me, the evidence of the Tenant is largely uncontested. The Tenant received numerous emails and correspondence from the Landlord or his representative telling the Tenant he had to leave the rental unit.

this occurred from February to May, 2023 when the parties came to a consent agreement to terminate the tenancy.

67. I am satisfied that the correspondence from the Landlord to the Tenant was unreasonable and substantially interfered with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit, and that the Landlords breached their responsibilities pursuant to section 22 of the Act.
68. I am also satisfied that the correspondence from the Landlord to the Tenant was of a nature that would be considered to be harassing and find the correspondence from the Landlord during this period was harassment, and that the Landlords' behaviour in sending several emails breached section 23 of the Act.

Illegal Entry

69. The Tenant alleges that the Landlord illegally entered the rental unit on August 22, 2022 when the Landlord entered the rental unit with an inspector from the City.

70. Section 27(1) of the Act states:

27 (1) A landlord may enter a rental unit in accordance with written notice given to the tenant at least 24 hours before the time of entry under the following circumstances:

1. To carry out a repair or replacement or do work in the rental unit.
2. To allow a potential mortgagee or insurer of the residential complex to view the rental unit.
3. To allow a person who holds a certificate of authorization within the meaning of the *Professional Engineers Act* or a certificate of practice within the meaning of the *Architects Act* or another qualified person to make a physical inspection of the rental unit to satisfy a requirement imposed under subsection 9 (4) of the *Condominium Act, 1998*.
4. To carry out an inspection of the rental unit, if,
 - i. the inspection is for the purpose of determining whether or not the rental unit is in a good state of repair and fit for habitation and complies with health, safety, housing and maintenance standards, consistent with the landlord's obligations under subsection 20 (1) or section 161, and
 - ii. it is reasonable to carry out the inspection.
5. For any other reasonable reason for entry specified in the tenancy agreement.

71. The Tenant testified that he asked the Landlord why he didn't provide notice prior to entry to which the Landlord replied that he didn't need to as the Tenant was occupying the room illegally.
72. The Landlord did not refute the Tenant's claim that notice was not given prior to entering the rental unit on August 22, 2022.
73. Based on the unrefuted evidence of the Tenant, and the Landlord's own admission, I am satisfied on a balance of probabilities that the Landlord entered the rental unit without providing notice to the Tenant pursuant to section 27(1) of the Act.

74. The Tenant did not provide any testimony as to what affect if any this illegal entry had on the Tenant.

Remedies

75. The Tenant is seeking the following remedies:

- a) A rent abatement of \$5,250.00
- b) Out-of-pocket expenses in the amount of \$114.00
- c) Other remedies consisting of \$15,000.00 for aggravation and \$5,000.00 for pecuniary damages; and
- d) A fine against the Landlord.

Rent Abatement

76. The Tenants claim for \$5,250.00 seeks various percentages in abatements of rent since April 2022.

77. Based on the evidence before me the Tenant's claims of substantial interference and harassment arose in February of 2023 and continued until the parties reach a consent agreement in May 2023 to terminate the tenancy effective September 1, 2023. I accept that the harassment events occurred over a period of three months, and find it reasonable that this course of harassing conduct impacted the Tenant's use and enjoyment of the rental unit. I make this finding based on the evidence of the Tenant cited below in his submissions on other damages, as they outline the impact of the Landlord's behaviour. I therefore award the Tenant a rent abatement of \$592.50 consisting of \$562.50 being a 25% rent abatement for February, March and April, and \$30.00 being a 4% rent abatement for August, due to the Landlord emptying the Tenant's bottles of water on August 1, 2023.

Out-of-Pocket Expenses

78. The Tenant seeks \$114.00 in out-of-pocket expenses being the cost of filing his application. The costs associated with the Tenant's application is \$53.00 not \$114.00. The Tenant is entitled to recover the \$53.00 paid for each application.

Other Remedies

79. The Tenant seeks \$10,000.00 in aggravated damages and \$5,000.00 in pecuniary damages.

80. With respect to the \$10,000.00 in aggravated damages the Tenant testified that he was experiencing stress and anxiety and was worried about eviction and the potential loss of his personal property due to the actions of the Landlord in attempting to illegally evict the Tenant.

81. The Board can award general damages and in the circumstances the Tenant shall be entitled to \$500.00 for the stress and anxiety due to the Landlords' actions.

82. The Board can not award pecuniary damages. However, the Tenant did not provide any evidence or submissions in support of any other quantifiable, out-of-pocket financial losses in relation to the Landlord's conduct to consider either under out-of-pocket expenses or general damages.

Administrative Fine

83. The Tenant sought an order that an administrative fine be imposed against the Landlords.

84. Section 31(1)(d) of the Act provide that a Tenant may request that the Landlord pay a fine of up to \$50,000.00 the current jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court.

31 (1) If the Board determines that a landlord, a superintendent, or an agent of a landlord has done one or more of the activities set out in paragraphs 2 to 6 of subsection 29 (1), the Board may,

(d) order that the landlord pay to the Board an administrative fine not exceeding the greater of \$10,000 and the monetary jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court;

85. While it is not binding upon me, the Board's Guideline 16 outlines relevant considerations in determining the appropriateness of an administrative fine:

An administrative fine is a remedy to be used by the Board to encourage compliance with the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 (the "RTA"), and to deter landlords from engaging in similar activity in the future. This remedy is not normally imposed unless a landlord has shown a blatant disregard for the RTA and other remedies will not provide adequate deterrence and compliance.

Administrative fines and rent abatements serve different purposes. Unlike a fine, a rent abatement is intended to compensate a tenant for a contravention of a tenant's rights or a breach of the landlord's obligations. File Numbers: LTB-T-074597-22 (formerly SOT-15435-20) LTB-T-074685-22 (formerly SOT-16695-20)

86. In effect, I should consider the nature and severity of the breach, the effect of the breach on the tenant, and any other relevant factors, such the conduct of the Landlord.

87. Deterrence for egregious conduct, beyond whatever deterrent effect simple damages might provide, is an over-riding factor.

88. In the circumstances an administrative fine is appropriate. The Landlord actions showed a complete disregard for the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* and the rights of the Tenant by attempting to terminate the tenancy without due process in circumvention of the Act. Additionally the actions of the Landlord having police attend the rental unit due to an "unwanted guest" being the Tenant and attempting to trespass the Tenant is further aggravating.

89. I don't believe the damages imposed would be a sufficient deterrent for the Landlords as such an administrative fine of \$2,000.00 will be imposed.

It is ordered that:

1. The total amount the Landlords shall pay the Tenant is \$1,598.50 This amount represents:
 - \$400.00 for a rent abatement related to the Tenants T6 applications.
 - \$106.00 for the cost of filing both the T2 and T6 applications
 - \$592.50 for a rent abatement related to the Tenants T2 application
 - \$500.00 for General Damages.
2. The Landlords shall pay the full amount owing by April 13, 2026.
3. If the Landlords do not pay the Tenant the full amount owing by April 13, 2026, the Landlords will owe interest. This will be simple interest calculated from April 14, 2026 at 4.00% annually on the balance outstanding.
4. The Landlords shall pay to the Landlord and Tenant Board an administrative fine of \$2,000.00 by April 14, 2026.

April 2, 2026
Date Issued

Sean Ramage
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.