



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

File Number: LTB-T-079564-25-RV

In the matter of: Unit 1, 111 NORTH SERVICE RD E
OAKVILLE ON L6H1A3

Between: Michael Iancov Tenant

And

Sunita Gite Landlord

Review Order

Michael Iancov (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Sunita Gite (the 'Landlord') :

- collected or retained money illegally (T1 Application)
- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenant or by a member of their household (T2 Application)

This application was resolved by order LTB-T-079564-25 issued on March 24, 2026.

On April 8, 2026, the Landlord requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. The Landlord did not attend the hearing that occurred on March 19, 2026. The Landlord states the following about their absence in the review request:

2. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Landlord was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. The Landlord has provided insufficient information to support the request.
3. In *So v. Canadian Mental Health Association, Toronto Branch*, 2024 ONSC 3371 (Div. Ct.) (CanLII), the Divisional Court affirmed that a person who requests a review of an order must give “sufficient information to support a preliminary finding of an alleged serious error or an explanation why the requestor was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing”, per Rule 26.8 of the Board’s Rules of Procedure.
4. The Divisional Court in *Wang v. Oloo*, 2023 ONSC 1028 (*‘Wang’*) considered the information required from a doctor’s note to support a finding that an adjournment was necessary. While this case involves a request for review not an adjournment request, and the Tenant is not the person who experienced the medical issue, I still find *Wang* informative about the type of information required about a medical condition to support a finding that someone cannot participate in a hearing. The Court states that doctor’s notes must contain sufficient information to enable the Court to exercise its own judgment as to whether the adjournment should be granted. The Court elaborates that this at a minimum should include a description of a diagnosis and other criteria not directly relevant to this review request.
5. The submissions in the review request are vague. The Landlord says that their family friend had a medical emergency without explaining what that emergency was. The Landlord states that the emergency was on the hearing date but does not provide any information about when specifically it happened. The hearing was scheduled in an all day block and based on the submissions in the request it’s not clear that the Landlord could not have taken steps to attend the hearing or notify the Board that the Landlord required an adjournment. The hearing proceeded virtually and could have been accessed with a telephone. The Landlord has not provided a doctor’s note to support that a medical emergency occurred, nor has the Landlord provided any of the information identified as being required by the Court in *Wang*.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-T-079564-25 issued on March 24, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

April 9, 2026
Date Issued

Amanda Kovats
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.