



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

Citation: Raemax Properties Inc. v Klapcic, 2026 ONLTB 32374

Date: 2026-04-20

File Number: LTB-L-001733-26-RV

In the matter of: 3, 587 ONTARIO ST
ST CATHARINES ON L2N4N9

Between: Raemax Properties Inc. Landlord
Rentals 101

And

Ines Klapcic Tenant

Review Order

Raemax Properties Inc. and Rentals 101 (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Ines Klapcic (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-001733-26 issued on March 24, 2026. A hearing was held on March 12, 2026 and the Tenant did not attend the hearing.

On April 15, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. The Tenant did not attend the hearing that occurred on March 12, 2026. The Tenant state the following, in part, about their absence in the review request:

The Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing held on March 12, 2026 due to significant personal and medical circumstances, including addiction-related issues, which impaired her ability to attend and meaningfully participate in the proceeding.

...

2. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. The Tenant 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, 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 Tenant’s review request are vague. The Tenant asserts they had personal and medical circumstances which prevented them from attending the hearing but did not explain the circumstances. The request is unclear as to why the Tenant did not attend the hearing or what steps they took to attend the hearing or notify the Board that they were unable to attend. The Tenant has not provided a doctor’s note to support that a medical issue prevented them from attending. The Tenant has not provided any of the information required by the Court as in *So* and/or *Wang*.
6. Given the above, the Tenant’s request is denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-001733-26 issued on March 24, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

April 20, 2026
Date Issued

Dana Wren
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.