



Order under Section 31 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Siu v. Ng; Ng v. Siu, 2026 ONLTB 32306

Date: 2026-04-27

File Numbers: LTB-L-064083-24

LTB-T-020442-24

LTB-T-092123-23

In the matter of: 755 CORNELL ROUGE BLVD
MARKHAM ON L6B0K2

Between: Man Wa Ng Tenant

And

Gordon Lee Landlords
Ada Wai Ching Siu

Ada Siu (the 'Landlord AS') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Man Wa Ng (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes. (L1 application)

The Tenant applied for an order determining that Gordon Lee and Ada Wai Ching Siu (AS) (the 'Landlords'):

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenant or by a member of their household.
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant. (T2 application)

The T2 application was heard by videoconference on October 10, 2024 and November 24, 2025. The L1 application was heard by videoconference on November 24, 2025.

The Landlord AS, the Tenant, and the Tenant's representative M. Lee attended the hearing on October 10, 2024. The Landlord AS and the Tenant's representative M. Lee (ML) attended the hearing on November 24, 2025. Schubert Au Yeung (SAY) testified on behalf of the Tenant on October 10, 2024.

Preliminary issues:

1. The L1 application names Schubert Au Yeung as a Tenant. In order LTB-L-092366-23, issued on September 4, 2024, I removed Mr. Au Yeung as a Tenant in all of the Landlord's applications respecting this tenancy. The application is amended to removed Mr. Au

Yeung's name. The application also names Michael Lee as a Tenant. The Landlords have never taken the position that Mr. Lee is a Tenant (in fact, they applied to have him declared an unauthorized occupant), and so Mr. Lee's name is also removed as a Tenant.

2. At the outset of the hearing of the L1 application on November 24, 2025, the Tenant's representative ML requested an adjournment so that he could prove that he and the Tenant vacated the unit on a different date than the Landlord submits they vacated. I denied this request. ML stated that he needs a police report to prove the date. He could not answer when he had requested the police report. The hearing took place in November 2025, approximately 11 months after the date the Landlords submit the Tenant vacated. The Tenant has had since that time to obtain the police report and ML did not adequately explain why neither he nor the Tenant did so during this time.
3. The Tenant filed two T2 applications. The first, LTB-T-092123-23, made an allegation about an illegal entry on October 31, 2023 and that AS threatened to change the locks on December 1, 2023. These allegations were amended and refined in the second application, LTB-T-020442-24. The remaining allegations in LTB-T-092123-23 lacked sufficient details and so these could not be addressed. Accordingly, LTB-T-092123-23 is dismissed. It was effectively replaced by application LTB-T-020442-24.
4. On October 1 and 2, 2024 the Tenant served on the Landlord and filed with the LTB proposed amendments to application LTB-T-020442-24 (see DOC-4237250 and DOC-4241691). The proposed amendments add some issues, fill in some missing dates, and add to the remedies requested. The Landlord AS opposed these amendments because in order to respond to them she would call her real estate agent as a witness. AS had already indicated at the hearing that she intended to call this person as a witness that day and so I was not satisfied that the Landlords would be prejudiced if these amendments were granted. The application is amended accordingly.
5. The application, as amended in October 2024, does not provide sufficient details, such as dates, for many of the allegations. I considered only the allegations for which sufficient details were provided.
6. The Tenant filed a second proposed amendment on November 16, 2025. The Tenant did not address this amendment request at the hearing on November 24, 2025 but if they had, I would not have granted it. The Tenant had completed giving her evidence in support of the application, including cross-examination of her witnesses, on October 10, 2024 and the Landlord had started giving her evidence in chief on that date. It would be too disruptive of the proceedings to permit any further amendments to the application in November 2025.

Determinations:

L1 application

7. The Tenant was in possession of the rental unit on the date the application was filed.
8. The Tenant vacated the rental unit on January 24, 2025. Rent arrears are calculated up to the date the Tenant vacated the unit

9. The lawful rent was \$1,300.00. It was due on the first day of each month.
10. The Tenant has not made any payments since the application was filed.
11. It is uncontested that the rent arrears owing to January 24, 2025 are \$8,825.76.
12. The Landlord incurred costs of \$186.00 for filing the application and is entitled to reimbursement of those costs.
13. There is no last month's rent deposit.
14. At the hearing ML sought to raise issues under s. 82 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'). Neither ML nor the Tenant served the Landlords with a list of the issues that they intend to raise. ML stated that he thought he had done so but he could not locate the email that he allegedly sent the Landlords. ML then stated that he had filed a "defense document" in another file related to this tenancy. Even if this other document lists the issues that the Tenant intends to raise, it was uploaded to a different file and so I am not satisfied that the Tenant gave the Landlord notice of the issues that she intends to raise. The Tenant did not comply with subs. 82(2) of the Act, which requires a tenant who seeks to raise issues under s.82 to give notice of those issues to the landlord.

T2 application

15. The application alleges the following:

- That the Landlords or their agent entered the unit illegally on October 30, 2023 and November 23, 2023;
- That the Landlords substantially interfered with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the premises as follows:
 - That the Landlord AS falsely accused ML of being an unauthorized occupant;
 - That from October 2023 to July 2024, the Landlord AS served the Tenant with at least 69 notices of termination and applications to evict, including two N11s, one N8, 15 N5s, two A1s, five N12s, one N6, eight N7s, two L8s, and three A2s;
 - That in November 2023 AS sought to illegally increase the rent from \$1,300.00 to \$2,600.00;
 - That in November 2023 AS contacted the Tenant's ex-spouse's employer;
 - That from November 2023 to August 2024 AS sent over 350 emails to ML;
 - That from November 25 to November 30, 2023, AS's representative delivered six notices of entry for similar reasons yet no clients or interested parties attended at the unit;
 - That on March 2, March 4, and June 8, 2024, AS requested to see the unit and claimed she would bring the police;
- That on October 31, 2023 and April 16, 2024 AS harassed the Tenant by threatening to illegally change the locks for the rental unit; and
- That the Landlords interfered with the supply of vital services to the unit.

16. In addition to the above (and in addition to the allegations that were not addressed because they disclosed insufficient details), the Tenant also alleged that AS has abused the processes at the LTB, the Human Rights Tribunal, and the Superior Court of Justice by filing vexatious claims against the Tenant and ML. This allegation was addressed in order LTB-L-015332-24, issued on November 13, 2024, which determines that is a vexatious litigant, and so it is not addressed in this order.
17. As explained below, the Tenant proved some of the allegations contained in the application on a balance of probabilities. Therefore, the Landlord must pay a rent abatement and an administrative fine.

Illegal entries and false accusation of drug activity

18. The Tenant's representative ML is her son and during the material times he lived with the Tenant in the rental unit.
19. ML testified that on October 30, 2023 the Landlord AS and her mother entered the rental unit without giving any notice and without giving any reason. ML testified that AS accused ML of hurting her mother, then asked to use the washroom, then pushed and attacked ML. ML called the police who attended and concluded that this was a civil matter. ML testified that AS told the police that the Tenant and ML were involved in an illegal drug operation. The next day AS sent an email following up with the investigating police officer asserting that the rental unit is her main residence and that she thinks the Tenant and ML "are doing illegal activities like drug." She asked the officer to investigate.
20. The police attended at the unit on November 23, 2023 and spoke with ML. No charges were laid and the police did not further investigate AS's allegation.
21. ML testified that at approximately 9:00 or 9:30 am on November 23, 2023 a representative of the Landlord AS came to the unit. ML and the Tenant were upstairs and heard someone trying to open the lock. They came downstairs and saw a woman at the door turning a key in the lock, about to open the door. Before she could open the door the Tenant asked who she is and why she was there. The woman responded that she is a representative of the Landlord and then she left. ML testified that the Tenant had received a notice for this proposed entry but it was for a different date.
22. ML testified that he did not remember if AS's representative entered into the unit on November 23, 2023, but if she did enter it was because the Tenant let her in.
23. AS acknowledged that she entered the unit on October 30, 2023 and that she gave no written notice for the entry. AS did not deny any of the conduct attributed to her by ML. AS testified and she did not know her legal obligations as a landlord although she has been a Landlord for 10 years. AS thought she could evict the Tenant and ML and so she entered the unit to inspect for renovations. AS testified that she rang the doorbell, there was no answer, and so she opened the door with her key. AS testified that she had not been allowed in the unit for 10 years and so she asked the police to investigate what is happening in the unit. AS acknowledged mentioning possible drug activity. When asked why she told the police that there may be drug activity in the unit she said it was because she had not seen the inside of the unit for 10 years.

24. Based on the evidence of both parties I am satisfied on a balance of probabilities that AS entered the unit illegally on October 30, 2023 and that AS falsely reported to the police that the Tenant and ML have been engaged in illegal drug activities in the unit. AS admitted to the illegal entry and to making these allegations to the police. AS's own evidence is that she basically had no legitimate reason to report alleged drug activity to the police.
25. I am not satisfied that an agent of the Landlords entered the unit illegally on November 23, 2023 because ML testified that either she did not enter the unit at all or, if she did, it was with the Tenant's consent. As per s.26 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'), a landlord may enter a rental unit without notice if the tenant consents to the entry. This also applies to a landlord's agent.

Unfounded unauthorized occupant application

26. The application alleges that AS falsely asserted that ML is an unauthorized occupant and threatened to evict ML or charge more rent. The application does not provide a date for the allegation that AS falsely accused ML of being an unauthorized occupant. However, this issue has been discussed in related proceedings and I am satisfied that AS was sufficiently on notice as to the conduct that is at issue in this allegation.
27. AS has filed many applications at the LTB seeking to evict the Tenant and ML. Several of these applications allege that there is an unauthorized occupant in the unit. At the hearing for LTB-L-092366-23, an L1 application, on July 30, 2024, AS testified that she had filed the application because she believed she could charge the Tenant what essentially amounts to a surcharge on top of the rent because AS believed ML to be an unauthorized occupant. AS had also filed an A1 application (LTB-L-000940-24) complaining that there is an unauthorized occupant in the unit and an A2 application (LTB-L-006790-24) alleging that the person "listed on the contract" is an unauthorized occupant. AS's applications were dismissed. All of these applications were considered in the context of a motion to declare AS a vexatious litigant, which was heard on June 4, 2024 and July 30, 2024 and was resolved by order LTB-L-015332-24, issued on November 13, 2024.
28. ML testified that AS's repeated unfounded allegations that he is an unauthorized occupant caused him and the Tenant great distress. He testified that AS asserted to them several times that she had consulted a paralegal about this issue, which he found puzzling because despite receiving this advice AS persisted in this allegation.
29. When she was asked what she did to educate herself as to what an unauthorized occupant is, AS responded that she filed an A2 and took no further steps to educate herself on this matter. AS did not deny telling ML that she had received advice about this from paralegals and AS did not testify that she had sought or received legal advice about this issue from anyone.
30. Based on AS's conduct in filing several applications falsely asserting that there is an unauthorized occupant in the unit and on the testimony given at the hearing on October 10, 2024, I am satisfied that AS made an unfounded allegation that ML is an unauthorized occupant and sought to evict him on this basis. This conduct substantially interfered with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the premises.

Frequent notices of termination

31. ML testified that the approximately 69 notices of termination and applications to terminate the tenancy caused the Tenant and himself distress and confusion. He characterized these notices as mental bombardment.
32. As mentioned above, AS has filed many applications at the LTB seeking to evict the Tenant and ML. All of these applications have been heard and none of them have been granted to date. In the orders for several of these applications, the notices of termination were found to be invalid.
33. AS acknowledged serving the number of notices alleged. She testified that she is not legally trained and finds the LTB's processes overwhelming. She testified that she served seven N12 notices because she made mistakes in each of them. When asked what she has done to inform herself as to the LTB's processes she testified that some time after June 4, 2024 she watched a video. Prior to that date she had joined an online landlord group and had called a paralegal.
34. I find that AS's conduct in serving a large number of notices of termination, most (if not all) of which are invalid, constitutes substantial interference with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the unit. A landlord is entitled to assert their legal rights by serving a notice of termination on a tenant and, for this reason, ordinarily the LTB will not find the conduct of serving one or even several notices of termination to be harassment or substantial interference. However, in this case AS served a large number of invalid and unmeritorious notices of termination as part of what appears to be a campaign to cause distress to the Tenant and ML. AS's claim that she is not legally trained is inadequate to explain the volume of these notices. At some point, after realizing that her previous notices were invalid, AS ought to have sought legal assistance with any subsequent notices. She testified that she called a paralegal but this appears to have been insufficient. It appears more likely than not that AS served many of these notices in bad faith. At the very least, AS served many of these notices recklessly, without concern that she would continue to make mistakes in the notices that she was serving.

Illegal rent increase and contact with Tenant's ex-spouse's employer

35. SAY is the Tenant's ex-spouse. SAY testified that AS spoke to him on the telephone around November 20, 2023 stating that she intends to increase the Tenant's rent to \$2,600.00. He testified that there are text messages between him and AS in which AS also stated that she wishes to increase the rent to \$2,600.00. SAY referred to exhibits 7 and 11 (filed by the Tenant as part of DOC-4237454). Exhibit 7 is at p.10 of the document. It is a text message from AS to SAY sent on November 6, 2023 proposing an increase in rent to \$2,600.00 with utilities included. SAY agreed to pass this proposal on to the Tenant but suggested a lower increase. Exhibit 11 is at p. 14 of the document. It is a text exchange between AS and SAY that took place on November 20, 2023 which starts with SAY pointing out that AS is asking for a rent increase but also appears to want to kick the Tenant out. A nonsensical exchange ensues where AS both denies and agrees that she has asked the Tenant for a rent increase and she wants the Tenant out of the unit.

36. SAY also gave evidence about AS contacting his employer. However, this allegation in the application does not state how AS's communication with SAY interfered with either SAY or the Tenant. For this reason, this allegation is not considered.
37. AS first denied attempting to raise the rent to \$2,600.00 and then testified that she had spoken about it with the Tenant (or with ML; this was not clear) but knew that they could not afford it.
38. I am not satisfied, based on the evidence before me, that AS substantially interfered with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the premises by proposing this increase. SAY's testimony and communications with AS show that this increase was an idea that AS floated with the Tenant (and SAY for some reason) but AS did not pursue it.

Excessive emails and notices of entry

39. ML testified that AS sent him a very large volume of emails and that most of these were duplicates of each other and very lengthy. The Tenant did not file any examples of these emails.
40. AS testified that each of these emails was a response to one of ML's emails and that ML sends 10-15 emails per day to her.
41. Without examples of the emails sent to ML I cannot be satisfied that they were not in response to ML's own emails. I am therefore not satisfied that AS's high volume of emails to ML constitutes substantial interference with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the premises.
42. ML testified that the same person who attended at the unit on November 23, 2023 served the Tenant with six notices of entry in November 2023. The Tenant did not file any of these notices. ML testified that he does not have these notices any more.
43. AS testified that she did not instruct her agent to deliver six notices of entry to the Tenant.
44. AS's testimony is essentially a denial of this issue and the Tenant did not file any of these notices. In the absence of this evidence, I am not satisfied, on a balance of probabilities, that AS caused her agent to serve six notices of entry on the Tenant in November 2023.

Threatened inspections with police presence

45. To support the allegation that AS threatened to inspect the unit with the police, ML filed a copy of an email from AS dated March 2, 2024 (DOC-4237351). This email, cc'd to a police officer, states: "Police will investigate you and your use at the unit." This email does not state that AS will attend the unit with the police. However, it does state that police will attend to investigate ML's use of the unit.
46. AS acknowledged that she has involved the police in communications with the Tenant and ML. She said that she does so because of "the assault." However, AS has not established that either the Tenant or ML assaulted AS or anyone else. When asked for the context of the email she sent on March 2, 2024, AS responded that ML had sent an email refusing inspections of the unit. The only email that AS was able to produce to show ML refusing an

inspection was dated after March 2, 2024 and so I cannot conclude that AS sent this email in response to any email from ML. At the hearing on November 24, 2025, when giving evidence about a different issue, AS offered more explanations for her email of March 2, 2024, including that the Tenant was not allowing AS into the unit and municipal and provincial authorities stated that landlords must inspect rental units every four months. AS produced no documentary evidence to demonstrate that this was the case.

47. Although the Tenant did not establish that AS threatened to inspect the unit with the police, she did establish that AS threatened to send the police to the unit to investigate, which captures the gist of what AS had threatened. The most threatening thing about AS's email is that she would have police attend the unit to investigate. Based on the email of March 2, 2024 and AS's inadequate explanation for it, I am satisfied that AS substantially interfered with the Tenant's reasonable enjoyment of the premises by threatening to have the police investigate the Tenant and ML at the unit.

Threats to change locks

48. ML testified that in October 2023 AS sent a text message to the Tenant threatening to change the locks for the unit. ML filed a copy of an undated text message that translates to "on December 1 I will change key" (DOC-4237317).
49. ML testified that the Tenant and ML received an email from AS on April 16, 2024 containing another threat to change the locks. ML filed a copy of this email (see DOC-4237314, p. 4), which states that the LTB did not deal with AS's allegation that the Act does not apply to the unit, and if the LTB does not respond within five days, AS will deem the unit to be exempt from the Act and will call the police to remove "the roommate" (presumably referring to ML) and AS will change the locks on April 22.
50. ML testified that the repeated threats to change the locks caused him and the Tenant constant anxiety and stress.
51. AS acknowledged sending these emails to ML and the Tenant. AS testified that she sent the email threatening a December 1 eviction before she knew about the LTB and the rules about tenancies. She testified that the police had told her she could evict the Tenant.
52. AS testified that she sent the email of April 16, 2024 because she had not received an answer from the LTB. Presumably AS meant that she expected the hearing of her L1 application LTB-L-001932-24, which occurred on April 16, 2024, to result in a finding that the Act does not apply to this tenancy. This was an unreasonable expectation. AS testified that because the LTB did not rule that the Act does not apply, she became aggressive. AS testified that she had a mental illness that affected her judgment and that she received treatment for this illness. She has not filed any documents to support that she has been diagnosed with any mental illness.

Vital services

53. The allegations in the application about interference with vital services are:

- that the Landlords and the Tenant had a dispute regarding the amount the Tenant owes for the cost of utilities;
- that AS threatened to cut off electricity to the unit; and
- that the Landlords changed the passwords to access the utilities accounts without notifying ML or the Tenant.

54. There is no allegation in the that the Landlords have cut off or interrupted the supply of any vital service to the Tenant. At the hearing on October 10, 2024 ML testified that there has been no hot water in the unit since July 2024 but this allegation was not pled in the application and ML offered no evidence to prove it at the hearing.

55. Based on the above I am not satisfied that the Landlords have interfered with the supply of any vital service. The dispute about how much the Tenant owes for utilities is the subject of other applications between these parties. The other allegations concern threats to terminate a utility or actions that impede the Tenant's ability to pay the utility providers directly but they do not allege an interference with any vital service.

Remedies

56. The Tenant seeks a rent abatement of \$15,600.00, that the Landlords be ordered to pay an administrative fine, and an order that the Landlords cease certain conduct. The Tenant and ML no longer live in the rental unit so it is not necessary or appropriate to order the Landlords to cease any conduct.

Rent abatement

57. An illegal entry is a breach of a tenant's privacy. In *Wrona v. Toronto Community Housing Corporation* (January 24, 2007) Toronto Docket No. 374/06, [2007] O.J. No. 423 (Div.Ct.) the Divisional Court replaced the decision of the LTB and granted the tenant an abatement of \$1,000.00 for a single illegal entry. This was well in excess of 100% of the monthly rent charged.

58. In *Wrona* the landlord had served a notice of entry but they had provided a very long window during which the landlord would enter. There had been at least one previous application brought to the Tribunal by the tenant about the same issue. In other words, there was a history of dispute between the parties about what constituted a legal entry. In this case there is no history of a dispute about illegal entries but there are other factors that exacerbated the breach of privacy experienced by the Tenant when AS entered without notice on October 30, 2023. AS also threatened to have the police investigate the Tenant and ML for drug activity although she had no basis to do so. AS's conduct in the unit after she entered was very aggressive. It appears she had no legitimate reason for the entry and so it appears the entry itself was meant to cause the Tenant and ML distress. Both ML and the Tenant testified that this incident caused them considerable distress.

59. Considering *Wrona*, AS's conduct, and the impact on the Tenant and ML, I believe an appropriate rent abatement in this case is \$1,000.00.

60. It is appropriate to assess the remedy for the issues of substantial interference and harassment together. AS's conduct has had a cumulative effect on the Tenant and her son ML. The allegations that the Tenant has proved are that AS threatened ML's housing (by asserting that he is an unauthorized occupant), AS threatened the Tenant's security of tenure (by issuing multiple notices of termination and threatening to change the locks), and that AS threatened to involve the police in the lives of the Tenant and ML. From October 2023 to July 2024 AS engaged in a pattern of conduct that caused the Tenant and ML a great deal of unnecessary stress. AS's conduct was unrelenting during this period and a lot of it appears to have been for the purpose of getting the Tenant to leave the unit.
61. Given the serious nature of this conduct, the time period during which it occurred, and the cumulative effect of this conduct on the Tenant and her son ML, I believe an appropriate rent abatement would be \$7,000.00. This is a bit less than the amount that would result from a 60% rent abatement for nine months (at monthly rent of \$1,300.00). During the relevant time period the Tenant and ML would be in constant fear of the next notice or email from AS making various threats against the tenancy or their peace of mind. After AS's illegal entry into the unit on October 30, 2023, the Tenant and ML were on edge with respect to the tenancy and each new threat afterward would have evoked greater and greater stress.

Administrative fine

62. The LTB's Guideline 16 states that the purpose of ordering an administrative fine is to encourage compliance with the Act and discourage breaches of the Act. A fine is not normally imposed unless a landlord has shown a blatant disregard of the Act and other remedies will not provide adequate deterrence and compliance.
63. In this case I am satisfied that AS has shown a blatant disregard of the Act. Based on AS's own statements it appears the Act has had very little bearing on AS's conduct. Her defense to the most serious allegations in this application is that she is unfamiliar with the Act and the LTB's processes but she has taken no reasonable steps to educate herself in these matters. It should have been obvious to AS after the hearing of her improperly filed L1 application (LTB-L-001932-24) on April 16, 2024 that her understanding of the Act is woefully inadequate, but later that day she threatened to change the locks because she was not getting what she wanted from the LTB. In this case it is appropriate to order AS to pay an administrative fine. I do not believe that the other remedies ordered in this matter will provide adequate deterrence and compliance.
64. Guideline 16 also addresses what factors the LTB may consider when deciding on the amount of fine to be ordered, including the nature and severity of the breach and the effect of the breach on the tenant. AS's breaches are very serious and severe. She has repeatedly threatened the Tenant's security of tenure, she has sought to circumvent the Act (including procedural protections for the Tenant), and her actions have made living in the unit very stressful. Considering all of these factors, AS will be ordered to pay an administrative fine in the amount of \$5,000.00. There is no indication that the other Landlord participated in the conduct that forms the basis for this fine and so only AS will be ordered to pay the fine.

It is ordered that:

L1 application

1. The tenancy between the Landlord and the Tenant is terminated as of January 24, 2025, the date the Tenant moved out of the rental unit.
2. The Tenant owes the Landlord \$9,011.76. This amount includes rent arrears owing up to the date the Tenant moved out of the rental unit and the cost of filing the application. The Landlord owes the Tenant \$8,048.00 (based on the T2 application). The amount owed by the Landlord is set off against the amount owed by the Tenant, **and so the Tenant shall pay to the Landlord \$963.76.**
3. If the Tenant does not pay the Landlord the full amount owing on or before June 30, 2026, the Tenant will start to owe interest. This will be simple interest calculated from July 1, 2026 at 4.00% annually on the balance outstanding.

T2 applications

LTB-T-092123-23

4. LTB-T-092123-23 is dismissed.

LTB-T-020442-24

5. The total amount the Landlords shall pay the Tenant is \$8,048.00. This amount represents:
 - \$8,000.00 for rent abatements for an illegal entry and for substantial interference and harassment of the Tenant.
 - \$48.00 for the cost of filing the application.
6. The Tenant owes an amount to the Landlords that is higher than the amount that the Landlords owe to the Tenant. As per paragraph 2, above, the amount owed by the Landlords shall be set off against the amount owed by the Tenant.
7. The Landlord AS shall pay to the Landlord and Tenant Board an administrative fine in the amount of \$5,000.00 by June 30, 2026.

April 27, 2026
Date Issued

Renée Lang
Vice Chair, 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.

Payment of the fine must be made to the LTB by the deadline set out above. If not paid, the outstanding amount may be sent to a collection agency and/or the party owing the money may not be permitted to file a new application until it is paid in accordance with section 196 the Act.

The fine can only be paid by money order, bank draft or certified cheque payable to the "Minister of Finance". The payment can be mailed or couriered to the LTB at 25 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor, Toronto, ON M7A 2G6 or dropped off at most Service Ontario locations.