



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

Citation: Veluppillai v Sehota, 2026 ONLTB 29308

Date: 2026-04-09

File Numbers: LTB-L-051132-25-RV
LTB-T-105948-24-RV

In the matter of: UPPER LEVEL, 150 Chessington Avenue
EAST GWILLIMBURY ON L9N0R6

Between: Thenmoly Veluppillai Landlord

And

Sandeep Sehota Tenants
Jonalyn Nob

Review Order

Thenmoly Veluppillai (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Sandeep Sehota and Jonalyn Nob (the 'Tenants') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenants owe.

The Tenants also applied for an order determining that the Landlord:

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- 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.

These applications were resolved by order LTB-L-051132-25/LTB-T-105948-24 issued on April 1, 2026.

On April 7, 2026, the Tenants requested a review of the order. On April 8, 2026 the Tenants filed additional materials in support of their review request.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing. In determining this request, I reviewed the review request and the additional materials filed by the Tenants.

Determinations:

1. The Tenants submit that the arrears were improperly calculated. However, they do not provide sufficient information to support this submission. The Tenants assert that the order fails to credit them with payments made from February to April 2026, totalling \$10,147.50. The hearing was held on January 30, 2026. The order was issued based on

the information given to the Board up to that date. Any payments made afterward would be taken into account by the Board in a motion to void the order.

2. In an interim order issued on November 17, 2025, the Tenants were directed to organize their documents in accordance with the LTB's practice direction on evidence, then serve their documents on the Landlord on or before November 24, 2025. The Tenants submit that this deadline was unrealistic. I do not agree. The Tenants should have organized their documents in accordance with the LTB's practice direction well before they were directed to do so. The interim order gave them a last chance to comply with the LTB's practice direction. In these circumstances, one week is a sufficient amount of time.
3. The Tenants submit that "certain evidence" was excluded for being outside of a one year "timeline." Paragraph 11 of the order states that some of the s.82 issues raised by the Tenants are raised more than one year after they occurred and so, pursuant to s. 29 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'), the order will only address those issues that were brought within time. It is not the Tenants' evidence that was out of time; it was the issues themselves. The Tenants have not identified any issues that they raised that were within time (i.e., were raised within a year of the event or situation) that were not addressed in the order and so I am not satisfied that the Member erred regarding the exclusion of any issues.
4. The Tenants submit that the order to pay the arrears in a lump sum is effectively eviction. This is correct and it is appropriate in the circumstances. Section 83 of the Act provides that the LTB can exercise discretion to either delay or deny eviction. The LTB does not have discretion to waive arrears that are owed by a Tenant and so when the LTB denies eviction in an arrears matter this takes the form of a payment plan. The Member considered relief from eviction pursuant to s.83 of the Act and decided to delay the eviction. There is no indication in the order or in the review request that the Tenants proposed a payment plan at the hearing. Considering that no payment plan was proposed, and the circumstances as set out in the order, I am not satisfied that the Member exercised his discretion under s.83 unreasonably.
5. The remainder of the review request identifies no errors in the order or in the procedure but states that certain determinations, findings, and directions are wrong and re-asserts submissions that were made at the hearing. A review is not an opportunity to re-litigate a matter in the hopes of achieving a more favourable outcome.
6. 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-051132-25 issued on April 1, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

April 9, 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.