



**Order under Section 87 / 88.2
Residential Tenancies Act, 2006**

File Number: LTB-L-050529-24

In the matter of: 15 GRENCER ROAD
BRADFORD ON N2H4X3

Between: KARNJOT PANACH Landlord
MANMOHAN SIGNH PANACH
KANWALJIT KAUR PANACH

And

LORNE RUSSELL BROWN Former Tenant

KARNJOT PANACH, MANMOHAN SIGNH PANACH and KANWALJIT KAUR PANACH (the 'Landlord') applied for an order requiring LORNE RUSSELL BROWN (the 'Former Tenant') to pay the rent and daily compensation that the Former Tenant owes.

KARNJOT PANACH, MANMOHAN SIGNH PANACH and KANWALJIT KAUR PANACH (the 'Landlord') applied for an order requiring LORNE RUSSELL BROWN (the 'Former Tenant') to pay the Landlord's reasonable out-of-pocket costs that are the result of the Former 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 February 9, 2026.

Only the Landlord's Representative, Elizabeth Anani attended the hearing.

As of 10:23 a.m., the Former Tenant was not present or represented at the hearing although properly served with notice of this hearing by the Landlord. There was no record of a request to adjourn the hearing. As a result, the hearing proceeded with only the Landlord's evidence

Determinations:

1. As explained below, the Landlord did not serve the Former Tenant with the application and Notice of Hearing using a method permitted in subsection 191(1.0.1) of the *Residential Tenancies Act*, 2006 (the 'Act') and Rule 3.3 of the LTB's *Rules of Procedure*. Therefore, the Landlord's application is dismissed.
2. The Former Tenant vacated the rental unit on June 21, 2024.

3. This application was filed by the Landlord on June 25, 2024, and previously came before the Board on November 18, 2025, at that time the Landlord had not served the Former Tenant a copy of the application, evidence, or Notice of Hearing. The Landlord was provided an adjournment so that they could serve the Former Tenant. The Landlord was also informed that failure to serve the Former Tenant would result in the application being dismissed. The next hearing was also peremptory on the Landlord.
4. At the hearing on February 9, 2026, the Landlord's Representative advised that the Landlord had attempted to send the application and Notice of Hearing to the Former Tenant by email. However, the Landlord's Representative acknowledged that the Landlord did not have confirmation that the Former Tenant received the email. There was no response from the Former Tenant and there were no read receipts or other communications confirming that the documents came to the Former Tenant's attention. The Landlord's Representative requested a further adjournment to permit the Landlord to seek permission to rely on email as an alternative method of service.
5. I denied the request for a further adjournment. The Landlord has had since the application was filed to serve the Former Tenant or to request permission to use an alternative method of service. The Landlord was provided an adjournment for that purpose and was advised of the consequences of failing to serve the Former Tenant. Given the prior adjournment, the peremptory nature of the hearing, and the absence of reliable evidence that the application and Notice of Hearing came to the Former Tenant's attention, I was not satisfied that a further adjournment was appropriate. Therefore, as the Landlord failed to prove proper service of the application and the Notice of Hearing, the application is dismissed.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlord's application is dismissed.

June 1, 2026
Date Issued

Joshua Labbe
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.