



**Order under Section 87 / 88.2 / 89
Residential Tenancies Act, 2006**

File Number: LTB-L-019274-25

In the matter of: 30 TROTTERS LANE
BRAMPTON ON L6Y 1B6

Between: Chandrasekharan Venkatramanan
Niranchana Krishnamoorthy Landlords

and

Ajay Kumar
Deepak Sharma
Gursimranjeet Singh
Jovanpreet Singh
Sukhmanpreet Singh
Satwinder Singh
Mandeep Singh Former Tenants

Chandrasekharan Venkatramanan and Niranchana Krishnamoorthy (the 'Landlords') applied for an order requiring Ajay Kumar, Deepak Sharma, Gursimranjeet Singh, Jovanpreet Singh, Sukhmanpreet Singh, Satwinder Singh and Mandeep Singh (the 'Former Tenants') to pay the rent and daily compensation that the Former Tenants owe.

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

The Landlords also applied for an order requiring the Tenants to pay the Landlords' reasonable out-of-pocket costs that the Landlords incurred or will incur to repair or replace undue damage to property. The damage was caused wilfully or negligently by the Former Tenants, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Former Tenants permitted in the residential complex.

This application was heard by videoconference on May 28, 2026.

Only the Landlord, Chandrasekharan Venkatramanan, and the Landlords' representative Mandeep Kaur and Seema Passi, attended the hearing.

As of 1:37 p.m. the Former Tenants were not present or represented at the hearing.

Determinations:

1. As explained below, the Landlord have failed to properly serve the Former Tenant with the application and notice of hearing. Therefore, the Landlord's application is dismissed.
2. This matter was called at 12:29 p.m. The Landlords' representative stated that all the Tenants, except for Satwinder Singh, were served by mail. I inquired as how the Landlords obtained the Tenants' mailing address. Ms. Kaur submitted that the Landlords obtained the Tenants' driver license when the tenancy commenced. I inquired as to why the Landlords believed the address on the license would be the same after they moved out of the property. In addition, I inquired regarding email service on Satwinder Singh. I asked the Landlords' representative whether she had any documentation establishing that the application and notice of hearing had been served on the Former Tenants or brought to the Former Tenants' attention. In order to provide the Landlords with an opportunity to address this issue, I held the matter down.
3. When the matter was recalled at 1:37 p.m., the Landlords' representative stated that the Landlords did not have the Tenants' driver license. The Landlords also did not have any evidence to establish that the email sent to the Satwinder Singh came to his attention. I also reviewed the Board's file and confirmed that the Landlords did not upload any documents while the matter was stood down. Therefore, I am not satisfied that the Landlords served the Former Tenant with the application and Notice of Hearing in accordance with section 189.0.1(2) *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'). In addition, this hearing date was the third scheduled hearing date for this application. The previous hearings were adjourned because service had not been completed as required by section 189.0.1(2). The matter was marked peremptory on the Landlords.
4. Section 189.0.1(2) of the Act states in relation to applications against former tenants no longer in possession of the rental unit that:

“(2) The applicant shall, within the time set out in the Rules, give the tenant or former tenant,

(a) a copy of the application; and

(b) a copy of any notice of hearing issued by the Board in respect of the application. 2020, c. 16, Sched. 4, s. 28.”
5. The service requirements for an L10 application are quite different than any other application. Specifically, it is the Landlord who must serve the Tenant with a copy of the L10 application rather than the Board. Further, the Tenant must have been served with a copy of the notice of hearing 30 days in advance of the hearing. This is contrasted with the other types of applications where the Board serves the parties with this information. E-mail service of L10 applications and notices are even more stringent requiring that the Landlord show that the documents came to the former Tenant's attention.
6. The L10 instructions and Certificate of Service are very clear that the Landlord is required to serve the Notice of Hearing to the Former Tenant. The L10 application refers the Landlord to the specific Certificate of Service and includes a hyperlink directly to that

document. It also states that if a Certificate of Service is not uploaded to the Tribunals Ontario Portal ('TOP'), the LTB may cancel the hearing and close the file.

7. In this case, I am not satisfied that the Landlords served the Former Tenants by a method provided for in the Board's Rules of Procedure, which states that the Landlord must demonstrate that the Former Tenant agreed, in writing, to service of documents via e-mail, and that it can be proven that the documents came to the attention of the Former Tenant. In addition, the Landlords had no evidence to demonstrate that the Former Tenants were aware of the hearing. Since the matter had already been adjourned on a prior date, and the Landlords was advised it was incumbent upon him to prove service at the next hearing date, I was not of the view it is appropriate to grant a further adjournment.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlords' application is dismissed.

June 2, 2026
Date Issued

Adeela Alvez
Member, Landlords and Tenants 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.