



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

Citation: Huron County Housing Corporation v Hallberg, 2026 ONLTB 39295

Date: 2026-05-14

File Number: LTB-L-003941-26-RV

In the matter of: 108, 134 SANDERS ST E
EXETER ON N0M1S1

Between:	Huron County Housing Corporation	Landlord
And		
	Britta Hallberg	Tenant

Review Order

Huron County Housing Corporation (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Britta Hallberg (the 'Tenant') because:

- the Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Tenant permitted in the residential complex has substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment or lawful right, privilege or interest of the Landlord or another tenant.

The Landlord also claimed compensation for each day the Tenant remained in the unit after the termination date.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-003941-26 issued on May 4, 2026.

On May 13, 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 alleges that the order contains a serious error. However, on review of the request, it appears that the real ground for the review request is an allegation that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the April 22, 2026 proceeding.
2. 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.
3. The review request submits that the Tenant was aware of the hearing date. However, on the date of the hearing, he was exhausted and slept through his alarm. The Tenant woke

up at 11:30 a.m., and contacted the Landlord at 1:00 p.m., to follow up on the outcome of the hearing.

4. I find that the Tenant had a reasonable opportunity to participate, but either did not exercise due diligence or chose not to attend the hearing (*Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs'ka*, 2017 ONSC 5541 CanLII (Div. Ct.)). The Tenant has the obligation of due diligence in ensuring they are available to attend the hearing. The Tenant's lack of due diligence is not a reasonable basis to rehear the application.

5. In *Berezovs'ka*, at para. 8, the Court noted that:

If parties are not diligent in dealing with legal proceedings then they cannot demand that a Tribunal waste its resources by rehearing matters a second time. To allow this would undermine the ability of the administration of justice to deliver timely, cost-effective and final orders.

6. The Tenant could have set multiple alarms to ensure he did not miss his hearing. I also note that, instead of attempting to log into the hearing room at 11:30 a.m., the Tenant waited until 1:00 p.m., to contact the Landlord regarding the outcome of the hearing. In my view, the Tenant did not exercise due diligence in ensuring his participation in the proceeding.
7. 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.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-003941-26 issued on May 4, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

May 14, 2026
Date Issued

Mayra Sawicki
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.