



Order under Section 31 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

File Number: LTB-T-098842-24

In the matter of: Unit 305, 40 SUNNY GLENWAY
NORTH YORK ON M3C2Z2

Between: Hariprasath Sankaran Tenant

And

Munir Madhav Landlord

Hariprasath Sankaran (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Munir Madhav (the 'Landlord'):

- altered the locking system on a door giving entry to the rental unit or residential complex without giving the Tenant replacement keys.
- did not give the Tenant a written tenancy agreement for their care home unit or the agreement did not include information about care services and meals and the charges the Tenant agreed to pay for them.

This application was heard by videoconference on April 9, 2026.

The Landlord and the Tenant attended the hearing.

Preliminary Issue:

1. On October 20, 2025, the Board issued an interim order after conducting an adjudicative case conference ("ACC") on October 15, 2025. In the interim order, the presiding member makes a determination that should the Tenant wish to amend their application, they must do so in accordance with Rule 15 of the Board's Rules of Procedure and no later than October 31, 2025.
2. The Tenant filed an amended application with the Board on October 31, 2025 and the Landlord confirmed receipt of this amended application. I accepted the amended application as it complied with the interim order issued by the Board on October 20, 2025.

Determinations:

1. At the hearing, I raised an issue in regard to the Tenant's amended application. Specifically, the application lacked any particulars relating to dates and times the issues giving rise to the application occurred.
2. The Divisional Court has held that in order to be considered, a claim must have sufficient details or particulars, including dates and times of the alleged offensive conduct, together with a detailed description of the alleged conduct complained of, to allow the person against whom the claim is made to know the case to be met and to prepare for the hearing accordingly. (Ball v. Metro Capital Property, [2002] O.J. No. 5931).
3. Although the Ball case related to the details required in a landlord's notice of termination, it reflects the general principles of procedural fairness, which include a party's right to know the case to be met. I cite the Ball case solely for this principle as I find it applies equally to tenant applications. The legal principles of fairness and natural justice demand that a party has a right to know the case against them and that they be provided sufficient details of the issues to determine whether to defend the claim.
4. As it pertains to the T2 Application, the Tenants claimed the Landlord substantially interfered with his reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit.
5. I am not satisfied that the Tenants' application contains sufficient details regarding the substantial interference. The application fails to provide a date or time or further details for that claim. As such, I find the Tenant's claim should be dismissed for lack of details as the Landlord did not have sufficient notice to defend that claim. This claim is dismissed.

It is ordered that:

1. The Tenant's application is dismissed.

April 27, 2026
Date Issued

Vishal Nanda
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.