



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

Citation: London and Middlesex Community Housing v Reddie, 2026 ONLTB 40058

Date: 2026-05-19

File Number: LTB-L-065538-25-RV3

In the matter of: 601, 136 ALBERT ST
LONDON ON N6A1M2

Between:	London and Middlesex Community Housing	Landlord
	And	
	Shenice Reddie	Tenant

Review Order

London and Middlesex Community Housing (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Shenice Reddie (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant failed to meet a condition specified in the order issued by the Board on May 30, 2025 with respect to application LTB-L-027410-25.

On August 25, 2025, Shada Simpson (the "Non-Party") requested a review of the order and that the order be stayed until the request to review the order is resolved. On August 26, 2025, interim order LTB-L-065538-25-RV-IN was issued, staying the order issued on August 15, 2025. The Non-Party's review request was resolved by review order issued on September 25, 2025.

On November 14, 2025, the Tenant request a review of the Review Order alleging she was not reasonably able to participate in the proceedings. On November 17, 2025, interim order LTB-L-065538-25-RV2-IN was issued, staying the Review Order issued on September 25, 2025. The Tenant's request for review was heard on December 3, 2025. On December 18, 2025, interim order LTB-L-065538-25-RV2-IN2 was issued granting the Tenant's review request and directing the matter to be heard de novo (anew).

A de novo hearing was held by videoconference on February 12, 2026, to consider this application. The Landlord's legal representative, Corrie Sanford and the Landlord's witness Eric Ballem attended the hearing. As of 9:36 a.m., the Tenant was not present or represented at the hearing. As such, the matter proceeded to be heard on an uncontested basis. The Tenant attended the hearing room after the hearing completed at 11:20 a.m. and was told an order would be issued and it was suggested the Tenant obtain legal advice as to next steps to have the matter re-heard. The Tenant explained her phone is not working properly. She was directed to speak with Legal Aid and advised she to find the telephone number on the notice of hearing.

The de novo hearing was resolved by order LTB-L-065538-25 issued on February 19, 2026.

On May 15, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing. In determining this request, I reviewed the materials in the LTB's file as well as the audio recording for this hearing.

Determinations:

1. On May 15, 2026 the Tenant filed a request to extend time to file a review of order LTB-L-065538-25-HR issued February 19, 2026. The 30 day deadline to file a review of the order fell on March 20, 2026.
2. Pursuant to Rule 26.4 of the Board's Rules of Procedure a request to review an order must be made within 30 days of the order being issued. This request has been filed 89 days after the order was issued. The delay is not insignificant.
3. The Tenant acknowledges in their request to review that they knew about and attempted to attend the hearing on February 12, 2026, and when they finally did were told the matter was heard in their absence. The Tenant submits they believed it would be adjourned. The Tenant states in their request to extend time that they only received notice of the eviction when the Sheriff posted a notice on their door.
4. A review of the Board's records shows the order was mailed to the Tenant on February 19, 2026 and was not returned. I am satisfied the Tenant was properly served the final order.
5. A review of the hearing recording indicates that the Member on February 12, 2026 told the Tenant to obtain legal advice and that an order would be issued. The Tenant was advised they would need to take steps to have the matter re-heard. In that context, the Tenant failed to explain why they did not seek legal advice, contact the Board, sign into the portal to review the status of the matter, contact the Landlord, and ultimately file a review earlier.
6. I find the Tenant's conclusion that the matter was adjourned is not reasonable nor supported by the record. No explanation was provided of efforts to contact the Board regarding the result of the February 12, 2026 hearing date, although the Tenant was aware it happened and aware they missed the date. No explanation was provided about efforts to contact a local legal clinic, the Landlord or to connect to the Board's portal about the results of the hearing.
7. The Landlord would be prejudiced if the request was granted because they would be denied their interest in finality for no sufficient reason.
8. For those reasons, the Tenant's request to extend time to file a review is denied.
9. In the alternative, I find the review request lacks sufficient information to support a preliminary finding that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceedings.

10. The Tenant submits in her review request that she slept past the hearing time because of sleep difficulties, her phone had died and she called right away. I am not satisfied that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate, in the absence of any supporting medical documentation that the Tenant suffers a sleep disorder which affects her ability to attend the hearing. I note the Tenant advised the Member when she arrived at 11:20 a.m. that her phone was having technical difficulties, not that she slept in.
11. Having reviewed the application record and the lengthy history of this matter, there have been multiple adjournments where the Tenant experienced technical difficulties. At the Adjournment on January 12, 2026 the Tenant was directed during the hearing to ensure she has a reliable internet connection and/or telephone access for the next hearing date. The Tenant had a similar difficulty connecting to the hearing on September 15, 2025 and attended late, after the hearing was held.
12. In my view there seems to be a pattern of behaviour that suggests lack of due diligence to ensure participation at the many scheduled hearings. No explanation was provided as to efforts made to ensure the Tenant's technical difficulties were managed as directed by the Member, to ensure participation such as going to the public library, contacting the Board to engage the Board's Public Access Terminal program or the telephone loan program.
13. I However, in *Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs'ka*, 2017 ONSC 5541 (Div. Ct.), the Divisional Court also held that: "*Lack of diligence in dealing with court proceedings is a reason for refusing to set aside an order where a party has failed to appear. In other words, it was not an error in law for the Review Board to find that lack of diligence constituted a reason not to grant the landlord a rehearing. 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.*"
14. For the above reasons and on the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Tenant provided sufficient information to establish a preliminary finding that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-065538-25 issued on February 19, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

May 19, 2026
Date Issued

Julie Broderick
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.