



Order under Section 135 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

File Number: LTB-T-098065-25

In the matter of: 490 REGAL DR
LONDON ON N5Y1K2

Between: Kushal Manish Modi Tenant

And

AMANDEEP GUGU Landlord

Kushal Manish Modi (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that AMANDEEP GUGU (the 'Landlord') collected or retained money illegally.

This application was heard by videoconference on April 30, 2026.

The Tenant did not attend the hearing however provided the Board with written authorization for an agent to represent the Tenant at the hearing. Three Tenant agents attended the hearing, Meet Anilbhai Patel, Vrajesh Mandanka, and Amandeep Gugu.

As of 11:51am, the Landlord was not present or represented at the hearing. As a result, the hearing proceeded with only the Tenant's evidence.

Determinations:

1. For the following reasons the Tenant's application is dismissed.
2. Board records indicate the Tenant filed the application with the Board on November 21, 2025.
3. The Tenant's application is blank and does not indicate any claim being made or identify any remedy the Tenant is seeking.
4. The Tenant agent Vrajesh submitted that the Landlord is aware of the issues and why the application has been filed and requested to proceed with the hearing.
5. The onus rests with the applicant, in this case the Tenant to provide sufficient evidence to support their claim.
6. The requirement for adequate particulars required within any notices of termination or as is in this case Board applications, has long been established by case law. The leading case regarding the requirement for sufficient reasons and details is *Ball v. Metro Capital*

Property, [2002] O.J. No. 5931. This case stands for the proposition that the kinds of particulars that should be contained in a notice should include “dates and times of the alleged offensive conduct together with a detailed description of the alleged conduct engaged in by the tenant”. The Court held that the tenant needs to know the specific allegations against him/her for three purposes:

- a. to know the case that must be met;
- b. to decide whether to dispute the allegations; or
- c. to consider whether to void the notice.

7. Although the decision in *Ball v Metro* applies to a Landlord’s N5 notice, I note that the same level of details like specifics on the claims being made and amount the Tenant is seeking is required in a T1 application in order for the Landlord to know the case to be met.
8. The Board’s T1 application forms have been developed with instructions to elicit the necessary details required for the Landlord to make a claim and provide sufficient reasons and details. For example, the description box under Reason 4 for a claim for damage states:

“REASONS FOR FILING THIS APPLICATION”

9. The form then goes on to specify each allegation the Tenant can choose from by selecting the check box and provides instructions for the Tenant to explain reasons and provide a requested remedy.
10. In the absence of any claim the Landlord does not know the case to be met and the Board cannot issue an order in the absence of a remedy.
11. Board records indicate the Tenant submitted evidence and the application was filed almost five months prior and the Tenant has had ample time to review the application and prepare well in advance of the hearing.
12. In my view the Tenant should have been more prepared and reviewed the application with his evidence submissions. Had this been done the Tenant would have had opportunity to amend the application and provide sufficient reason and details for his claim.
13. For all the reasons above the Tenant’s application is dismissed.
14. This order contains all reasons for the determinations and order made. No further reasons will be issued.

It is ordered that:

1. The Tenant's application is dismissed.

May 13, 2026
Date Issued

Greg Brocanier
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.