



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

Citation: Chima v Singh, 2026 ONLTB 36259

Date: 2026-05-04

File Number: LTB-L-035001-25-RV

In the matter of: 3866 FOXBOROUGH TRAIL
MISSISSAUGA ON L5N7T9

Between: Jitendra Singh Chima Landlord

And

Pal Singh Former
Mandeep Heer Tenant

Review Order

Jitendra Singh Chima (the 'Landlord') applied for an order requiring Pal Singh and Mandeep Heer (the 'Former Tenant') to pay the rent and daily compensation that the Former Tenants owe, and unpaid utilities.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-035001-25, issued on April 27, 2026.

On May 2, 2026, the Tenants 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 that the Tenants were not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding, or that there is a serious error in the LTB's decision.
2. The application was heard on April 14, 2026. The Tenants did not attend, and the matter was decided based on the Landlord's evidence. The Tenants request a review.
3. The Tenants state that there is another ongoing proceeding between the parties, LTB-T-016400-25. In that proceeding, the Tenants are represented by Christopher Karas and the Landlord is represented by Vijay Sood. Mr. Sood also represented the Landlord in this proceeding.

4. The Tenants argue that, because Mr. Karas represents them in the other proceeding, communications and correspondent in this proceeding ought to have been brought to Mr. Karas' attention.
5. I am not persuaded by the Tenants' argument, for two reasons.
6. First, lawyers and paralegals are generally retained to act in specific matters. Mr. Karas was retained to represent the Tenants in LTB-T-016400-25, which is a different proceeding from this one. When the present proceeding was initiated, notice of it was properly served directly on the respondent Tenants. It is well established that an originating process must be served on the respondent, not on counsel who may represent them in a different matter. Having been served with notice of this proceeding, the Tenants were then free to retain Mr. Karas to represent them if they so chose. Absent any notice that Mr. Karas had been retained in this matter, all notices and communications were properly sent to the Tenants.
7. Although not clearly articulated, the Tenants may be arguing that Mr. Sood was obligated to advise Mr. Karas of this proceeding. They have not cited any authority for that proposition. While it might have been professionally courteous to advise Mr. Karas of this proceeding, I do not see how notice to Mr. Karas could have been required for a proceeding in which he was not retained.
8. Second, the Tenants were properly served with notice of this proceeding. They have not asserted, in their review request, that they did not receive the notice. Hence, even though Mr. Karas did not know about the proceeding, the Tenants knew about it and had every opportunity to participate, either by representing themselves or by retaining Mr. Karas to represent them.
9. For those reasons, I am not satisfied that the Tenants were not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
10. The Tenants also argue that the LTB erred by finding that they owed rent arrears. They point to a text message from the Landlord which, they argue, demonstrates that they paid their full rent.
11. If the Tenants wished to adduce evidence that they did not owe rent arrears, they should have attended the hearing. The LTB did not err by deciding the case based on the evidence before it.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-035001-25, issued on April 27, 2026, is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

May 4, 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.