



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

Citation: Campeau v Lafond (Levesque), 2026 ONLTB 35528

Date: 2026-04-30

File Number: LTB-L-007131-26-RV

In the matter of: Basement, 54 Kinmount Private
Kanata ON K2T1K3

Between: Lynne Campeau Landlord

And

Angele Lafond (Levesque) Tenant

Review Order

Lynne Campeau (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Angele Lafond (Levesque) (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-007131-26, issued on April 14, 2026.

On April 30, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

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

Reasons:

1. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order, that a serious error occurred in the proceedings, or that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
2. This was an application by the Landlord to terminate the tenancy because of rent arrears. The Tenant agreed that she owed arrears of \$2,503.00. The Member ordered that the tenancy would be terminated unless the full arrears, and costs, were paid by May 10, 2026.
3. On review, the Tenant argues that the Member made several errors. I will consider each in turn.
4. First, the Tenant argues that the Member “added 20 days to a standard order,” which should have led to a payment deadline of May 15, not May 10.

5. The Tenant has not explained why she thinks that the Member “added 20 days.” There is nothing in the Member’s Reasons indicating that she intended to postpone a standard order by 20 days. The Member simply finds that a postponement to May 10, 2026 would be appropriate. There is no error in that finding, and the Tenant has not identified any reason to think that the Member intended to postpone the deadline to May 15 instead.
6. Second, the Tenant argues that the Member erred by refusing to allow her to raise issues pursuant to section 82 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (RTA) and seek monetary remedies to be applied against the arrears.
7. The Tenant did not disclose her section 82 issues at least seven days before the hearing, as required by Rule 19.4. She did not provide a satisfactory explanation for failing to do so, as required by section 82(1)(b). The Member did not err in refusing to allow the issues to be raised. The Tenant is free to file her own application seeking monetary remedies for her complaints.
8. On review, the Tenant has filed a large volume of material which appears to be intended as an explanation for why she did not disclose her section 82 issues on time. The Tenant had the opportunity, at the hearing, to explain why she had not disclosed her issues on time. She did not provide a satisfactory explanation. The purpose of a review is not to present a better or different case in the hope of achieving a different result. The Member did not err in refusing to allow the section 82 claims based on the explanation given at the hearing.
9. Third, the Tenant argues that the Member “was not able to take into account” evidence that the Landlord had interfered with the Tenant’s income, reneged on a payment agreement, and was in serious breach of her obligations. The evidence might have been relevant to whether discretionary relief under section 83(1) of the RTA or mandatory relief under section 83(3) should have been granted.
10. The Tenant has not explained, in her request, what the evidence was or why the Member was not able to take it into account. If she is referring to documents, photos, or other like evidence, then the Member correctly excluded that evidence because it was not disclosed at least seven days before the hearing in accordance with Rule 19.1.
11. However, the Tenant could still have given oral testimony regarding any circumstances relevant to section 83(1) or 83(3) relief. She does not say, in her review request, that she offered oral testimony or that the Member refused to allow it.
12. The Tenant also does not say, in her review request, that she argued at the hearing that eviction should be refused pursuant to section 83(3). The Member’s Reasons indicate that the Tenant only requested a delay pursuant to section 83(1)(b), to give her time to pay the arrears. The Member granted that request, and delayed the deadline to May 10.
13. For those reasons, on the basis of the submissions made in the review request, I am not satisfied that the Member erred or that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate. The Member properly refused to permit the Tenant to raise issues under section 82. She

properly considered section 83, and in fact granted the relief the Tenant requested under section 83. The review will be denied.

14. I note that the Tenant requested the delay so that she could pay her arrears. She still has until May 10 to do so. She can still save her tenancy by making the payment she said she would make.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-007131-26 issued on is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

April 30, 2026
Date Issued

Dale Whitmore
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.