



Order under Section 88.2/89 of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Milla v Corradini, 2026 ONLTB 41499

Date: May 27, 2026

File Number: LTB-L-029835-22-HR2

In the matter of: 124 Bridgeport Road East
Waterloo, ON N2J 2K4

Between: Karen Milla Landlord

and

Christopher Corradini and Michael Corradini Former Tenants

DE NOVO HEARING ORDER

NOTE: Although Christopher Corradini and Michael Corradini are defined as “Former Tenants” in the style of cause and referred to as such throughout this hearing order, this is merely a reflection of how the applicant/Landlord listed them as respondents in the L10 application. This is not a formal determination made by the LTB about the legal position of these parties or whether they are in fact “Former Tenants”.

Procedural History of Application

On March 1, 2022, Karen Milla (the 'Landlord') applied in a L10 application seeking an order that Christopher Corradini and Michael Corradini (the 'Former Tenants') owed her for:

- rent and/or compensation that was not paid during the tenancy;
- utility costs that were the Former Tenants' responsibility during the tenancy;
- reimbursement for reasonable costs to repair or replace willful or negligent damage to the rental unit or residential complex; and
- reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a result of the Former Tenants' or their visitors' substantial interference with the Landlord's reasonable enjoyment or lawful right, privilege, or interest.

The L10 application was heard by videoconference on January 26, 2023. Only the Landlord's side attended the hearing. The L10 application was resolved by order LTB-L-029835-22 issued on February 8, 2023 (the 'L10 Order'), which awarded various monetary remedies to the Landlord.

On December 30, 2025, Michael Corradini filed a request to extend the time to file a request to review. He also requested a stay and review of the L10 Order, claiming there were serious errors in the order, and that he was not reasonably able to participate in the L10 proceedings.

Review interim order LTB-L-029835-22-RV-IN was issued on January 6, 2026 granting the extension, staying the L10 Order, and directing the request to a review hearing.

The review hearing was conducted by videoconference on January 27, 2026. The Former Tenant Michael Corradini attended with his legal representative Martin Calderon (paralegal). The Landlord attended with her legal representative Brittany Colley (paralegal). Although I was not satisfied the other Former Tenant Christopher Corradini had been properly served with the notice of review hearing, the hearing proceeded in his absence since I determined there was no prejudice to any party.

Michael Corradini's request for review was granted because I determined he was not reasonably able to participate in the prior L10 hearing and proceeding. My reasons for granting the review are contained in review order LTB-L-029835-22-RV issued on March 4, 2026. A *de novo* (new) L10 hearing was ordered to be scheduled.

The *de novo* (new) L10 hearing was heard by videoconference on May 13, 2026. The Landlord attended with her legal representative Brittany Colley (paralegal). The Former Tenant Michael Corradini attended with his legal representative Martin Calderon (paralegal). As of 9:10am, the Former Tenant Christopher Corradini was not present or represented at the hearing. For the reasons explained below, I determined the Former Tenants were not properly served with notice of the review hearing.

Determinations:

1. At the start of the hearing, I raised a preliminary issue with respect to service of the L10 Application and the Notice of Hearing for the *de novo* (new) hearing scheduled for May 13, 2026.
2. Section 189.0.1 of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'), and Rule 5.8 of the LTB's *Rules of Procedure* require a landlord to serve all former tenants with a copy of the L10 application and the Notice of Hearing, at least 30 days in advance of a hearing. Section 191 (1.0.1.) of the Act and Rule 3.3 provide the accepted and allowable ways a landlord may serve a former tenant with the required materials. Rule 5.16 also requires that a Certificate of Service signed by the person who served the application and notice of hearing, must be filed with the LTB at least 20 days before the hearing date set in the Notice of Hearing.
3. I note that the LTB's portal for this matter did not contain any recent Certificate of Service at least 20 days before the May 13th hearing. The Landlord's legal representative advised that the current notice of hearing had not been served. The Landlord only had evidence of the prior notice of hearing (the original L10 hearing) being served, and a stale certificate of service from the prior hearing.
4. Since the request for review was granted, this proceeding is now starting fresh as a *de novo* L10 proceeding. The Landlord may be able to rely on the prior service of the L10

application, if no amendment is being sought in *de novo* hearing. However, the Landlord cannot rely on the stale service documents from the prior L10 proceeding for service of the notice of hearing since May 13, 2026 is a new hearing date compared to the prior L10 hearing conducted over 3 years ago.

5. There may be an argument that for the Former Tenant Michael Corradini, knowledge about the hearing was demonstrated since he was present at the hearing with his legal representative. Therefore, there may not be any prejudice to proceed with the *de novo* hearing as against Michael Corradini. However, the Landlord was unable to prove how the same could be demonstrated for the other Former Tenant, Christopher Corradini who has not shown up for any of the hearings held at the LTB.
6. The Landlord confirmed she would like to continue pursuing the *de novo* application against Christopher and he was a Former Tenant. The application was not withdrawn with respect to Christopher Corradini.
7. In the circumstances, I find the Landlord failed to comply with the statutory requirements of the Act and the Rules regarding service of the new notice of hearing (for the *de novo* hearing) at least 30 days before the hearing; and the Landlord failed to comply with the LTB's Rules which require a Certificate of Service filed with the LTB at least 20 days before the hearing.
8. The Landlord's legal representative requested an adjournment to effect proper service. The legal representative for Former Tenant Michael Corradini objected to the adjournment request.
9. In these circumstances, I do not find it appropriate to adjourn the matter. The Landlord was represented by a legal professional throughout the proceeding. For the prior L10 hearing, the Landlord's side had attempted to serve both Former Tenants (address used for Christopher disputed by Michael due to estrangement). The Landlord's side also filed a Certificate of Service for the prior L10 hearing. There is no excuse or reasonable explanation why the statutory requirements of the Act and the LTB's Rules were not followed for the *de novo* hearing.
10. Although not argued, I note that my review order indicated the LTB will serve the parties with the new notice of hearing. This is a courtesy done to all parties or interested/potential parties listed as a party contact in the Board's portal on every file. This application has gone through a history at the LTB including prior hearing days for prior L10 hearing and a review hearing. These elements made it necessary for the LTB to serve all potential parties associated with the file; however, the LTB's actions are independent to the obligations on landlords when they make claims against former tenants. Nothing the LTB does as an administrative function, negates or removes any statutory requirement of the Act for an applicant party to fulfil certain requirements – such as the specific requirements in this case placed on a landlord for certain types of applications (such as a L10 application).
11. Considering the history of this proceeding, I do not find granting an adjournment would fulfil the Board's responsibility to be expeditious, as required by section 183 of the Act. The issue of proper service was not a new issue for the Landlord to consider. The service requirements were demonstrated by the Landlord for the prior L10 hearing, so the

Landlord knew or ought to have known service would be an element that must be proven for the *de novo* hearing.

12. The adjournment request was denied. I did not have jurisdiction to proceed with adjudicating the L10 application since the service requirements on the Former Tenants were not satisfied by the Landlord.

It is ordered that:

13. The L10 application is dismissed.

May 27, 2026
Date Issued

Michelle Tan
Vice Chair, 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.