



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

File Number: LTB-L-093669-25-RV

In the matter of: Second Floor Unit, 7 Highbourne Rd
Toronto Ontario M5P2J1

Between: Bernard Thompson Landlord
Susan Chang

And

Ifraan Ahmad Tenant
Shahida Baig

Review Order

Bernard Thompson and Susan Chang (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Ifraan Ahmad and Shahida Baig (the 'Tenant') because the Landlord has entered into an agreement of purchase and sale of the rental unit and the purchaser in good faith requires possession of the rental unit for the purpose of residential occupation.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-093669-25 issued on February 20, 2026.

On March 20, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. In the review request, the Tenant submitted that it was a serious error for the Landlord's three L2 applications regarding the purchaser's use of the residential complex to be heard separately. There was no request made to combine the files before the hearing. Of the three files, the current one has been determined, LTB-L-093649-25 has been withdrawn, and LTB-L-093662-25 is still in the hearing stage. There are no inconsistencies with LTB-L-093649-25, and it is not yet certain that the Member's findings in LTB-L-093662-25 will differ. Moreover, the applications concern different rental units and different intended occupants. I am not satisfied that it was necessary for the applications to be heard together.
2. In the review request, the Tenant provided additional submissions regarding the application. The Board's review process is not an opportunity for a party to re-argue a

matter that has been determined, with the hope of achieving a different result. All evidence and submissions should have been presented during the initial hearing.

3. In the review request, the Tenant alleged various errors of fact and challenged the Landlord's credibility. The Tenant also submitted that it was an error to proceed with the application in the face of deficient declarations. The Member provided detailed reasons for her determinations, referencing both parties' evidence, and addressing each issue. As such, I am satisfied that the Member considered the parties' evidence and submissions when making her determinations. The Member's findings were therefore reasonable and entitled to deference.
4. In the review request, the Tenant submitted that the Member refused to hear evidence regarding an MLS listing, a child swearing a declaration for another application, and that the Landlord failed to disclose the other N12 notices served on his application. I am satisfied that the Member considered all the relevant evidence and refused to consider evidence that was not relevant. Given that the Tenant was aware of the other N12 notices the Landlord served, there was no prejudice in continuing with the hearing despite the omission on the application.
5. In the review request, the Tenant submitted that they conducted a title search after the hearing and discovered that the purchaser owns multiple properties. New evidence is only a ground for review in situations where the new evidence was material to the issues in the hearing and where it was not available on the date of the hearing with the exercise of due diligence. It is unclear why the Tenant could not have done a title search before the hearing. Moreover, ownership of multiple properties is not indicative of good or bad faith intentions by a purchaser in moving into a rental unit.
6. In the review request, the Tenant submitted that the Member ignored several cases from the Supreme Court of Canada which require parties to act honestly in the performance of their contractual obligations. I am satisfied that the Member considered the appropriate legal test under section 49 of the *Residential Tenancies Act* (2006) (the 'Act') and the relevant case law, and that her findings are consistent with the Act.
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.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-093669-25 issued on February 20, 2026, is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

April 9, 2026
Date Issued

Kate Sinipostolova
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.