



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

Citation: Kuhnreich v Williams, 2026 ONLTB 33447

Date: 2026-04-23

File Number: LTB-L-109554-25-RV

In the matter of: 509, 819 KENNEDY RD
SCARBOROUGH ON M1K2E4

Between: Heshi Kuhnreich Landlord

And

Harry Williams Tenant

Review Order

Heshi Kuhnreich (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Harry Williams (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Tenant permitted in the residential complex has substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment or lawful right, privilege or interest of the Landlord or another tenant.

The Landlord also claimed compensation for each day the Tenant remained in the unit after the termination date.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-109554-25 issued on April 14, 2026.

On April 22, 2026, the Landlord requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. The order under review dismisses the Landlord's application to terminate the tenancy and evict the Tenant because the Landlord did not give sufficient direct evidence to establish the grounds for eviction on a balance of probabilities.
2. The Landlord submits that he was denied procedural fairness in the hearing. The Landlord submits that the Member required the Landlord to turn on their camera but did not require the Tenant to turn on their camera. The Landlord submits that this caused him not to ask all of his questions because he was continually wondering why he had to be on screen but the Tenant did not.

3. There is no indication in the review request that the Landlord asked the Member during the hearing why he was required to turn on his camera and the Tenant was not. This would have been a simple way to resolve his confusion.
4. The Landlord has not stated what questions he would have asked or what lines of inquiry he would have pursued had he not been distracted by his confusion as to why the Tenant did not have to turn their camera on. The application was dismissed because the Landlord did not provide direct evidence of the incident at issue. Without knowing the line of inquiry that the Landlord would have pursued if he wasn't confused, I cannot conclude that the outcome of the proceedings would have been different if the Tenant's camera had been on. The problem with the Landlord's evidence was that it was insufficient; it was not that the Landlord had failed to ask the right questions.
5. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order or that a serious error occurred in the proceedings.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-109554-25 issued on April 14, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

April 23, 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.