



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

Citation: Margaret Laurence Housing Co-operative Inc. v Jama, 2026 ONLTB 30092

Date: 2026-04-14

File Number: LTB-C-014064-25-RV

In the matter of: 1607, 81 Dalhousie St
Toronto ON M5B2N1

Between: Margaret Laurence Housing Co-operative Inc. Co-op

and

Ifrah Jama Co-op Member

Review Order

Margaret Laurence Housing Co-operative Inc. (the 'Co-op') applied for an order to end the occupancy of the member unit and evict Ifrah Jama (the 'Co-op Member') because:

The Co-op also claimed compensation for each day the Co-op Member remained in the unit after the termination date.

This application was resolved by order LTB-C-014064-25 issued on February 24, 2026.

On March 11, 2026, the Co-op Member requested a review of the order and that the order be stayed until the request to review the order is resolved.

On March 12, 2026, interim order LTB-C-014064-25-RV-IN was issued, staying the order issued on February 24, 2026.

This application was heard by videoconference on March 31, 2026.

Hunter Stone, the Co-op's Legal Representative, and Karanvir Bajwa, attended for the Co-op. The Co-op Member also attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. On the basis of the submissions made, I am not satisfied that the Co-op Member was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. Accordingly, the Co-op Member's request to review must be denied.

2. The Co-op Member testified that she was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing on January 27, 2026 because of a medical emergency. She testified that she was in a lot of pain that day, so she was not able to attend, and she went to the hospital the next day.
3. I am not satisfied that the Co-op Member was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. There are reasons to doubt the Co-op Member's claim. The Tenant's testimony was that she was in so much pain she could not call into the hearing but yet she did not seek medical attention until the following day. It would be reasonable to expect that if the Co-op Member was in as much pain as she states, that she would have sought immediate medical attention.
4. Additionally, while the Co-op Member may have thought the medical issue will pass, this is still not a reasonable explanation for not at least calling into the hearing to request an adjournment or asking someone to call in on her behalf.
5. Of course, the phrase "reasonably able to participate" is to be interpreted broadly. Where a party had a genuine intent to participate but was prevented from doing so, a re-hearing should be held to give them an opportunity to participate... However, there is a difference between being prevented from attending and failing to make reasonable efforts to attend. A party must demonstrate that they exercised diligence in their effort to attend the original hearing. If a party is not diligent in dealing with legal proceedings, they cannot expect the Board to hold a second hearing.
6. While I am mindful that being reasonably able to participate must be interpreted broadly, the Court has held that a party must demonstrate that they exercised diligence in their effort to attend the original hearing¹. I am not satisfied that the Co-op Member exercised diligence in her efforts to attend the original hearing.
7. As I am not satisfied that the Co-op Member was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding, the request for review must be denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-C-014064-25 issued on February 24, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.
2. The interim order issued on March 12, 2026 is cancelled. The stay of order LTB-C-014064-25 is lifted immediately.

April 14, 2026
Date Issued

Candace Aboussafy
Member, Landlord and Tenant Board

15 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2G6

¹ *Kizemchuk v. 60 Montclair Limited*, 2024 ONSC 6140 (CanLII)

If you have any questions about this order, call 416-645-8080 or toll free at 1-888-332-3234.