



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

File Number: LTB-L-096385-25-RV

In the matter of: 445 VAN DUSEN AVE
SOUTHGATE ON N0C1B0

Between: Sobia Fareed Landlord
Ghulam Fareed

And

Jessica Rosati Grundy Tenant
Matthew Kadeem Sobaram

Review Order

Sobia Fareed and Ghulam Fareed (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Jessica Rosati Grundy and Matthew Kadeem Sobaram (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-096385-25 issued on January 7, 2026.

On January 16, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order and that the order be stayed until the request to review the order is resolved.

On January 19, 2026, interim order LTB-L-096385-25-RV-IN was issued, staying the order issued on January 7, 2026.

The review request was heard by videoconference on March 19, 2026.

The Landlord, the Landlord's Legal Representative David Borrie, and the Tenants attended the hearing. Hazan Fareed interpreted for the Landlord.

Determinations:

1. Application LTB-L-096385-25 was heard by videoconference on December 15, 2025. Both parties attended. Based on the evidence provided at the hearing, the tenancy was terminated. On January 16, 2026, the Tenants requested a review based on new evidence.
2. The Tenant, Jessica Rosati Grundy ('JG'), testified that, on December 11, 2025, the second-named Tenant, Matthew Kadeem Sobaram ('MS'), attended an employment interview and was offered the job the same day. However, as the employment was a

hybrid contract, the employer needed several days to finalize the employment letter, which was only provided to the Tenants on December 18, 2025. MS testified that he requested an official employment letter during his interview, but it was still not provided to him until after the hearing, December 18, 2025. MS admitted that his employment has since terminated but stated that he is now self-employed and receiving income.

3. The Landlord's Representative submitted that the Member presiding at the initial hearing considered the Tenants' testimonies regarding the employment offer and terminated the tenancy anyway. The Representative submitted that MS's employment has since terminated, placing the Tenants in the same position they were in at the time of the initial hearing. The Representative submitted that the Landlord is prejudiced due to the increasing rent arrears.

4. *Interpretation Guideline 8: Review of an Order* states:

Parties are expected to make every effort to produce all relevant evidence in support of their positions in the original hearing. The review will be dismissed unless the LTB is satisfied the new evidence could not have been produced at the original hearing, is material to the issues in dispute and its consideration could change the result.

5. Both Tenants were direct in their testimonies and consistent under cross-examination. As such, I am satisfied, on a balance of probabilities, that MS was offered employment on December 11, 2025, and that he requested an official employment letter, but was not provided one until December 18, 2025. I am satisfied that the Tenants exercised their due diligence in obtaining the employment letter, but it still could not have been produced at the original hearing on December 15, 2025. I am also satisfied that the employment letter was material to the issues in dispute in this application; namely, whether the Tenants have the means to repay the rent arrears.
6. However, I am not satisfied that considering this evidence would change the result, since the employment has been terminated. Although MS submitted that he now had self-employment income, this does not meet the test of new evidence, as it relates to events that occurred after the initial hearing took place. The purpose of new evidence as a ground for review is not to capture updates about a party's circumstances or updates about new events that occurred after a hearing.
7. Therefore, MS's employment letter does not meet all the elements of the test for new evidence, and the review request is denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-096385-25 issued on January 7, 2026, is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.
2. The interim order issued on January 19, 2026, is cancelled. The stay of order LTB-L-096385-25 is lifted immediately.

April 14, 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.