



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

Citation: Salandra v Morrison, 2026 ONLTB 35965

Date: 2026-05-01

File Number: LTB-L-019237-26-SA-RV

In the matter of: 2, 36 PARK BLVD
Toronto ON M8W1G8

Between:	Luigi Salandra	Landlord
	And	
	Steven Morrison	Tenant

Review Order

Luigi Salandra (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Steven Morrison (the 'Tenants') and for an order to have the Tenant pay compensation for damage they owe because the Tenant failed to meet a condition specified in the order issued by the Board on January 26, 2026 with respect to application LTB-L-066312-25.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-019237-26 issued on April 23, 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.

Determinations:

Tribunal Ontario Portal File Issue:

1. The Tenant filed a request to review the April 23, 2026 order related to file LTB-L-019237-26
2. At the same time, the Tenant also filed a request to review the order issued for LTB-L-066312-25.
3. The Tenant inadvertently included reasons for each request in the opposite file. I have considered the reasons filed with LTB-L-066312-25 for the review request related to LTB-L-019237-26.

The Review Request

4. By way of background the Tenant's set aside motion was heard on April 21, 2026. The order was issued on April 23, 2026 where the motion was denied and the stay lifted.
5. In the review request, the Tenant challenges the outcome of the order related to the parties and the overall termination of his tenancy. The Tenant believes he should have been given a payment plan and the Member did not properly weigh his evidence.
6. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order.

The Parties

7. The Tenant takes issue with the removal of a second named Tenant from the order. This matter was resolved by LTB-L-066312-25. The Member opted to restrict the order to Steven Morrison for consistency.
8. The Member, at paragraph 3 and 4 of the April 23, 2026 order considers the appropriate party to be Steven Morrison as the order issued is limited to the eviction.
9. As it was not disputed that the other Tenant vacated in May 2025, the order appropriately notes that Steven Morrison is properly before the Board as there is no consequence related to the outcome of the Tenant's motion relative to the former Tenant.
10. Given the above, there is no serious error in the order.

The Tenant's overall challenge of the order

11. Essentially, the balance of the review request seeks to challenge the final outcome of the order, the termination.
12. For clarity, in the April 23, 2026 order, the presiding Member sets out the findings related to the breach, the analysis of the circumstances of the Tenant and the Landlord and her reasons to support the decision to deny the Tenant's motion. The Member also details consideration related to the lifting of the stay.
13. The Tenant's review makes a number of references to evidence that was presented at the hearing with respect to his ability to pay the rent and arrears owing.
14. In the order at paragraph's 7 to 11, the Member considers the same reasons as articulated in the Tenant's review request. Disagreeing with the findings of fact that a Member makes is not on its own a basis for review.

15. Reviews are not an opportunity for a party to correct their own mistakes or do a better job at presenting their evidence. Reviews address errors made by the Board so the Tenant's belief that the outcome should have been different is not a serious error on the part of the Board that can form the basis for a request for review.
16. The Tenant assertion that the LTB "should have followed precedent" related to a payment plan is unsupported by evidence. To my knowledge there is no precedent that the Board is required to implement a payment plan. Rather, s.78(11)(b) of the Act requires the Member to consider all of the circumstances. Again, the order clearly sets out the Member's consideration of all of the circumstances and reasons to support her decision to deny the motion and lift the stay. The Member was not required to implement a payment plan even if the Tenant has the ability to meet his financial obligations and in this case, to pay the rent on time. The Tenant's claims related potential damages for his application is mere speculation and would not have likely changed the outcome of this order.
17. The Member's decision to deny the motion was based on the Tenant's repeated failed promises to pay the rent owing on time. The Member's decision, based on the evidence and circumstances presented at the hearing falls within a reasonable range of outcome.
18. Therefore, as a result of all of the above, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order. The request to review must be denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-019237-26 issued on April 23, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

May 1, 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.