



**Order under Section 69 / 88.2
Residential Tenancies Act, 2006**

Citation: Dhillon v Mezei, 2026 ONLTB 40688

Date: 2026-05-25

File Number: LTB-L-006856-26

In the matter of: 982A THE QUEENSWAY
Mississauga ON M8Z1P6

Between: Inderpreet Dhillon Landlord

And

Hijnalka Mezei Tenant

Inderpreet Dhillon (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Hijnalka Mezei (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 Tenant has been persistently late in paying the Tenant's rent.

The Landlord also applied for an order requiring the Tenant to pay the Landlord's reasonable out-of-pocket expenses that are the result of the Tenant's failure to pay utility costs they were required to pay under the terms of the tenancy agreement.

This application was heard by videoconference on April 23, 2026.

The Landlord and the Tenant attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. For the following reasons, the Landlord's application is dismissed.
2. I say this because the notices of termination are both invalid. The lease agreement identifies the rental unit as "2nd Floor – 982A". The Landlord's application identifies the rental unit as "982A". At the hearing, I shared my screen and showed a "Google street view" of the rental unit which confirms that the unit is located on the upper level of the complex with a commercial unit below. The picture also confirms that the rental unit has an "A" as part of the unit number. The Landlord confirmed at the hearing that the rental unit

was located on the upper floor above a commercial unit and he confirmed that the unit has an “A” as part of the unit number.

3. The rental unit identified on the N5 and N8 notices of termination fail to include a “2nd Floor”, or “Upper Level” and do not include an “A” as part of the unit number. This means that the notices of termination fail to correctly identify the rental unit. As the notices fail to correctly identify the rental unit, they do not comply with the mandatory requirements outlined in section 43 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006*, S.O. 2006 (the ‘Act’) and the notices are therefore invalid. As the notices are invalid, they cannot result in a termination of this tenancy. This means the portion of the Landlord’s application related to terminating this tenancy must be dismissed.
4. The remaining portion of the Landlord’s application alleges that the Tenant has failed to pay utility bills. The problem here is that the Landlord’s application claims unpaid utilities for one bill for the period of December 3, 2025, to January 6, 2026, in the amount of \$213.59. However, prior to the hearing, the Landlord uploaded at least 10 utility bills commencing April 4, 2025, to early 2026 which total approximately \$2,256.02. At the hearing, the Landlord was unable to provide a reasonable explanation for this large discrepancy. For this reason, I find that the Landlord has failed to establish on the balance of probabilities that the Tenant failed to pay utility bills or that the Landlord is entitled to be compensated for the \$213.59 they claim in their application. This portion of the Landlord’s application is therefore dismissed.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlord’s application is dismissed.

May 25, 2026
Date Issued

Laura Hartslief
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.