



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

Citation: 390 Dufferin GP Inc. v Mashadi, 2026 ONLTB 28558

Date: 2026-04-07

File Number: LTB-L-106222-25-RV

In the matter of: B419, 410 DUFFERIN ST
TORONTO ON M6K0H1

Between: 390 Dufferin GP Inc. Landlord

And

Mansoor Mashadi Tenant

Review Order

390 Dufferin GP Inc. (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Mansoor Mashadi (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-106222-25 issued on March 23, 2026.

On April 2, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing.

Determinations:

1. This review request does not state the grounds upon which it is made.
2. The hearing that gave rise to the order under review took place on February 26, 2026. The Tenant attended. The parties agreed to an order on consent after engaging in mediation.
3. In the review request the Tenant submits that at the hearing they “did not know [they] could come to court and explain [their] situation.” It appears that the Tenant did not inform themselves as to the procedures at the LTB prior to the hearing date. This was not an error of the LTB and it would not support a submission that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceedings. At the outset of the hearing block the Member delivered a preamble during which they explained that the parties are entitled to a hearing but if they would prefer mediation they may attempt it with an LTB mediator. The preamble also explains what mediation is. I further note that the LTB’s records indicate that the Tenant received advice from Tenant Duty Counsel prior to the hearing. It does not make sense that the Tenant did not know they could have a hearing rather than engage in mediation.

4. The Divisional Court has stated that “parties ought not to be easily able to revisit Board orders that have been made on consent. The effective resolution of matters that come before the Board will be greatly impaired if parties can continually seek to revisit issues that they have earlier agreed to resolve.” (*Trust Construction Corporation v. McKie*, 2017 ONSC 4702)
5. The Divisional Court also stated that “The policy of the courts is to promote settlement. The discretion to refuse to enforce a settlement should be exercised rarely...agreements, and joint submissions, are serious and they should not be easy to simply overturn. To allow parties, after the fact, to raise claims they could have or allow second thoughts after an agreement is struck would cause unnecessary waste on our Tribunals and Courts. No one, even with an order, would feel safe to rely on what has been agreed to. This would not be a just result.” (*Gent v. IMH Pool III LP*, 2017 ONSC 7230 CanLII)
6. The review request does not provide a sufficient reason to revisit the consent order
7. 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-L-106222-25 issued on March 23, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

April 7, 2026
Date Issued

Renée Lang
Vice Chair, 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.