



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

Citation: Durham Region Local Housing Corporation v Griffiths-Cillis, 2026 ONLTB 38495

Date: 2026-05-12

File Number: LTB-L-024147-26-RV

In the matter of: 010, 385 ROSA ST
PORT PERRY ON L9L1M9

Between:	Durham Region Local Housing Corporation	Landlord
And		
	Gail Griffiths-Cillis	Tenant

Review Order

Durham Region Local Housing Corporation (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Gail Griffiths-Cillis (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant failed to meet a condition specified in the mediated settlement signed by the parties on December 8, 2025 with respect to application LTB-L-067321-25.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-024147-26 issued on April 30, 2026.

On May 11, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. The Tenant did not attend the hearing that occurred on April 28, 2026.
2. The Tenant states the following about their absence in the review request:

I was not able to participate in the proceeding as I was sick and on heavy medication...
3. The remainder of the request argues the circumstances of the breach.
4. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
5. In *So v. Canadian Mental Health Association, Toronto Branch*, 2024 ONSC 3371 (Div. Ct.) (CanLII), the Divisional Court affirmed that a person who requests a review of an order must give "sufficient information to support a preliminary finding of an alleged

serious error or an explanation why the requestor was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing”, per Rule 26.8 of the Board’s Rules of Procedure.

6. The Divisional Court in *Wang v. Oloo*, 2023 ONSC 1028 (‘Wang’) considered the information required from a doctor’s note to support a finding that an adjournment was necessary. While this case involves a request for review not an adjournment request, I still find *Wang* informative about the type of information required about a medical condition to support a finding that someone cannot participate in a hearing. The Court states that doctor’s notes must contain sufficient information to enable the Court to exercise its own judgment as to whether the adjournment should be granted. The Court elaborates that this at a minimum should include a description of a diagnosis and other criteria not directly relevant to this review request.
7. The submissions in the review request are vague. The Tenant says they were sick and medicated on the hearing date but does not provide sufficient information about why they could not attend the hearing. The hearing was scheduled in a morning block and it is not clear that the Tenant could not have taken steps to attend the hearing or notify the Board that they required an adjournment. The hearing proceeded virtually and could have been accessed by the Tenant or someone supporting the Tenant to request an adjournment. The Tenant has not provided a doctor’s note to support that a medical issue prevented them from attending the hearing, nor has the Tenant provided any of the information identified as being required by the Court in *Wang*.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-024147-26 issued on April 30, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

May 12, 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.