



Order under Section 30 and 31 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

File Number: LTB-T-102465-24

In the matter of: 150 ALBANY ST
SUDBURY ON P3C2Z5

Between: Ashley Moise
Jessica Decata
Tenants

And

Robert Blanchet
Landlord

Ashley Moise and Jessica Decata (the 'Tenants') applied for an order determining that Robert Blanchet (the 'Landlord'):

- entered the rental unit illegally.
- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenants or by a member of their household.
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenants (T2 application).

The Tenants also applied for an order determining that the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act') or failed to comply with health, safety, housing or maintenance standards (T6 application).

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

The Tenants and the Tenants' Representative, Birttany-Rose Ward and the Landlord attended the hearing.

Determinations:

1. As explained below, the Tenants proved some of the allegations contained in the application on a balance of probabilities. Therefore, the Landlord shall be required to compensate the Tenants pursuant to the terms of this order.

T2 / Illegal Entry:

2. The Tenants testified that during their residential tenancy, the Landlord entered the rental unit illegally, without serving the Tenants with proper notice pursuant to the Act. The Tenants testified to the Landlord entering the unit illegally on eight separate occasions.
3. On April 14, 2024, the Landlord and another individual entered the Tenants' rental unit and performed an inspection of the unit. The Landlord walked through the rental unit and made a list of items that required the Landlord's attention. The Tenants were not provided with a written notice of entry prior to the Landlord's entry on this date. The Tenants did receive an email from the Landlord on or about April 11, 2024, letting them know that he will be attending the unit on April 14, 2024, between 12:00 p.m., and 12:30 p.m. The Tenants consented to the Landlord's entry on this date.
4. On May 20, 2024, the Landlord's father and another male individual entered the Tenants' rental unit for the purposes of assessing and inspecting what work was required to have an outdoor water faucet installed. The Landlord's father and individual inspected the basement and outside of the property, but no work was completed during this visit. The Tenants received a text message from the Landlord hours prior to the intended attendance and agreed/consented to this entry which was confirmed by their text communications.
5. On May 22, 2024, the Landlord's father and another individual attended the Tenants' rental unit unannounced and stated that they needed access to the basement for the purposes of taking additional photographs to start work on having an outdoor water faucet installed. The Tenants notified the Landlord of their concern that same evening, to which the Landlord responded by apologizing and confirming that in the future he would be providing the Tenants with a minimum of 24 hours' notice as required. A copy of the email communications was tendered as evidence by the Tenants. The Landlord's father made plans with the Tenants to return to the unit on the following day at 4:30 to drill a hole for the installation of the outdoor water faucet.
6. On May 23, 2024, the Landlord's father and two unknown individuals attended the rental unit at approximately 3:45 p.m., prior to the time that the Landlord's father and the Tenants had agreed upon. The Tenants were not at home at the time, with only the Tenants' young daughter at home. The Landlord's father was not permitted entry into the home on this date, and no work was completed. The Tenants emailed the Landlord to inform him of their concern regarding a lack of notice prior to attending or entering the unit.
7. On May 28, 2024, the Landlord attended the rental unit for the purposes of collecting a ladder from the backyard of the rental unit. The backyard was exclusively used by the Tenants. The Tenants received an email from the Landlord on May 26, 2024, informing the Tenants that the Landlord would be attending the property to pick up his ladder from the backyard between 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
8. On May 28, 2024, the Tenants sent the Landlord an email informing the Landlord of their concerns with lack of notice for entries. The Tenants also requested the issuance of proper notices, and that the Tenants would not be accepting any text messages or calls asking to enter the unit moving forward.

9. On August 18, 2024, at 2:00 p.m., the Landlord's agent attended the rental property with approximately five individuals who identified themselves as contractors. The Tenants testified that two of the men stayed outside during the visit, one of the men stayed in the living room, and two other men walked around and inspected the bathroom upstairs. No work was completed on this date or entry. The Tenants received an email from the Landlord on August 17, 2024, at approximately 10:00 a.m., notifying the Tenants that he will be sending contractors the following day between the hours of 2:00 p.m., and 4:00 p.m.
10. The Tenants responded to the Landlord email on August 17, 2024, by informing the Landlord that the notice he sent the Tenants was not legal and that the Landlord needed to get the work done rather than attending and inspecting the property multiple times with no results.
11. On September 5, 2024, at approximately 10:00 a.m., the Landlord attended the rental unit for the purposes of carrying out work inside of the unit. The Tenant was in the shower at the time of the Landlord's entry and was startled by seeing him inside of the rental unit. The Tenant requested that the Landlord leave the rental unit which the Landlord complied with. The Landlord did email the Tenants a notification on September 1, 2024, informing the Tenants that the Landlord would be entering the rental unit between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., for the purposes of carrying out electrical repairs. The Tenants did not expect to see the Landlord despite receiving this notice because the parties had a dispute the previous day.
12. On September 24, 2024, the Landlord and/or agent thereof, attended the rental unit at approximately 10:00 a.m., and proceeded to start drilling on the exterior wall of the rental property. The Tenants called the police department because the Landlord was banging on the Tenants' front door aggressively. The police attended the rental property and asked the Landlord and contractor to leave the property. The Landlord sent the Tenants an email on September 22, 2024, informing the Tenants that the Landlord will be attending the property on September 24th, and 25th, 2024, between the hours of 9:00 a.m., to 7:00 p.m. The Tenants responded to the Landlord's email communication informing the Landlord that they felt the notice was invalid and not legal. The Tenants did not consent to the Landlord's entry on September 24, 2024.
13. The Landlord did not return to the rental unit on September 25, 2024, based on the recommendation of the police department.
14. The Tenants testified that the Landlord never obtained the Tenants' consent for email service of documents and notices and sought compensation in the amount of \$8,000.00 for the eight entries as described above.
15. The Landlord testified that he always provided the Tenants with notice in advance of the intended entry. The Landlord would often provide the Tenants with more than 24-hour notice as he would try to provide 48 to 72 hours' notice when possible. The Landlord sent the Tenants these notifications of entry by way of email and text message. The Landlord did not have the Tenants' consent for service of documents and notices by email communications. The Landlord was unable to serve the notices at the Tenants' rental unit because he stated that he lived in Toronto, which was a far drive to the rental unit.

16. The Landlord also testified that the Tenants agreed to allow the Landlord into the rental unit for many of the entries raised by the Tenants. The Landlord testified to having the Tenants' permission to enter the unit on April 14, 2024, and May 20, 2024.
17. The Landlord testified to serving the notices for the purposes of inspecting the rental unit and performing necessary repair work. The Landlord believed that serving the Tenants with notice of entry by email was an acceptable method of service if the notices were served a minimum of 24 hours in advance of the intended entry. The Landlord did not dispute his father attending the unit without notice of entry on May 22, 2024.
18. Section 191(2) of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006, reads as follows:

(2) A notice or document that is not given in accordance with this section shall be deemed to have been validly given if it is proven that its contents actually came to the attention of the person for whom it was intended within the required time period. 2006, c. 17, s. 191 (2).
19. This means that a notice that is not served in accordance with the Act, or the Rules, shall be deemed to have been validly given if it is proven that its contents came to the attention of the person for whom it was intended within the required time period. I believe this section speaks directly to the Landlord's service of the notices of entry by text and email communications because the Landlord did not have the Tenants' consent for email service, but the notices did come to the attention of the Tenants within the required timeframe.
20. Based on the evidence, I find that the Landlord did not enter the unit illegally on April 14, 2024, and May 20, 2024. I make this finding because the Tenants permitted the Landlord's entry at the time of the Landlord communicating his intent to enter the unit, and at the actual time of entry into the unit. I also do not find that the Landlord's actions substantially interfere with the Tenants' reasonable enjoyment on these dates because the Tenants permitted entry at the time.
21. I find that the entry on May 22, 2024, was illegal because the Landlord failed to provide the Tenants with notice of entry as required. The Landlord's father and a contractor attended the rental unit unannounced for the purposes of inspecting the unit for installation of an outdoor water faucet. I also find that this action would substantially interfere with the Tenants' reasonable enjoyment of the unit. I find the amount of \$250.00 to be appropriate in these circumstances.
22. I do not find that the attendance on May 23, 2024, was an illegal entry. I make this finding because the Landlord's father attended the unit prior to the time agreed upon with the Tenants. He was not permitted entry because the Tenants were not home. The Landlord's father did not enter the unit on this date. The Tenants had agreed to allow the Landlord's father entry at a certain time and were therefore aware he would be attending. Having said this, arriving at a time outside of the agreed hours is not appropriate and would substantially interfere with the Tenants' reasonable enjoyment of the unit. Therefore, I find it appropriate to award the Tenants \$100.00 for this incident.
23. I do not find the entry or attendance on May 28, 2024, to amount to an illegal entry. The reason I make this finding is because the Tenants were made aware of the entry and

Landlord's intent to retrieve the ladder more than 24 hours in advance of the intended entry. Despite the Landlord sending this notification by email, the notice would still be deemed delivered as the information in the email came to the Tenants' attention within the time required. Therefore, I find no compensation is appropriate for this incident.

24. I do not find the entry or attendance on August 18, 2024, to amount to an illegal entry. The reason I make this finding is because the Tenants were made aware of the entry and Landlord's intent to enter the unit in advance of the entry. Despite the Landlord sending this notification by email, the notice would still be deemed delivered as the information in the email came to the Tenants' attention within the time required. Having said this, I do find that the number of attendances for the purposes of inspecting the property without doing any work to be excessive and would substantially interfere with the Tenants' reasonable enjoyment. Therefore, I find the amount of \$100.00 to be appropriate to award for this incident.
25. I do find the entry or attendance on September 5, 2024, to be an illegal entry. The reason I made this finding is because the notice of entry was invalid. The Tenants were made aware of the entry more than 24 hours in advance of the intended entry. Despite the Landlord sending this notification by email, the notice would still be deemed delivered as the information in the email came to the Tenants' attention within the time required. I do find the notice to be invalid because the time of entry is shown to be between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., which the Courts have held to be unreasonable. I also find an eight hour window to be unreasonable, apart from certain circumstances which did not apply in this case. Therefore, I find compensation in the amount of \$100.00 to be appropriate for this incident.
26. I also find that the entry on September 24, 2024, to be an illegal entry. The reason I made this finding is because the notice of entry was invalid. The Tenants were made aware of the entry more than 24 hours in advance of the intended entry. Despite the Landlord sending this notification by email, the notice would still be deemed delivered as the information in the email came to the Tenants' attention within the time required. I do find the notice to be invalid because the time of entry is shown to be between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., which the Courts have held to be unreasonable. I also find a ten hour window to be unreasonable. Therefore, I find compensation in the amount of \$100.00 to be appropriate for this incident.

T2 / Harassment:

27. The Tenants testified that the Landlord harassed the Tenants by way of serving multiple notices of termination without merit for the purpose of harassing the Tenants. The Tenants were served with an N5 notice of termination for damage to property and substantial interference. The notice was based on the Tenants installing security cameras without the Landlord's consent and authorization. The Landlord claimed the installation of the cameras caused damage. The Tenants confirmed the installation of the camera did require a small hole for a screw to hold the camera in place.

28. The second notice was given to the Tenants for substantial interference because the Tenants were filming the Landlord and/or contractor when they attended the rental unit to perform inspections/repairs.
29. On December 27, 2024, the Tenants contacted the police to assist in having the Landlord removed from the property and claimed that the Landlord was harassing the Tenants. The Landlord was arrested and charged with criminal harassment. The Landlord was given a peace bond for the period of May 29, 2025, to May 29, 2026.
30. The Landlord testified that he served the Tenants with the notices of termination for substantial interference and damage because he believed that the actions taken by the Tenants warranted the issuance of a notice of termination. The Landlord testified that he did not issue the notices for the purposes of harassing the Tenants. The notices were defective due to errors.
31. Based on the evidence, I am not satisfied that the Landlord harassed the Tenants. I make this finding because I do not have sufficient evidence to find that the notices of termination that the Landlord served the Tenants were without merit. Nor do I have sufficient evidence to find that the Landlord's actions on December 27, 2024, amounted to harassment, criminal or otherwise. Therefore, I do not find it appropriate to award any compensation for these incidents.

T6 / Bathtub / Bathroom Tiles:

32. The Tenants testified that the bathtub in the bathroom located on the upper level was leaking water. The water would weep below into the kitchen ceiling which caused the kitchen ceiling to begin bubbling, cracking, warping, and showing signs of water damage. The Tenants reported this issue to the Landlord in writing on February 28, 2024, by email communication. The Tenants testified that because of the leak, the Tenants were unable to take a bath or shower in this washroom. The Tenants were able to use the shower in the second bathroom but had to go to the basement to do so. The Tenants testified that this issue was never repaired or corrected by the Landlord.
33. The Landlord testified that he did not ignore the issue of the upstairs bathroom and scheduled contractors to do the work on September 24, 2024, but he was unable to do so, because the Tenants contacted the police department and had the Landlord and his contractor leave the property. The Landlord also testified that the Tenants did not feel comfortable having the walls removed in the bathroom. The Landlord completed the repairs required after the Tenants vacated the rental unit. The Landlord did not attempt to re-schedule the work to be completed after September 24, 2024.
34. Based on the evidence, I am satisfied that the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act')., I make this finding because I find the Landlord's attempt to have the repair work carried out in September 2024, unreasonable given the fact that he was initially made aware of the issue in February 2024, and either personally attended or had someone attend the rental unit multiple times in April, May, and August 2024. The Tenants did not cooperate with the Landlord's efforts in September 2024, onward. This does not excuse the Landlord from having the repairs completed.

Water leak / Kitchen Ceiling:

35. The Tenants testified that the water leak from using the bathtub upstairs caused water to leak down to the ceiling of the Tenants' kitchen below. Because of this, the Tenants stopped using the bathroom upstairs for showering or bathing. The washroom was limited to washing hands and brushing teeth. The kitchen ceiling showed signs of water damage. The Tenants notified the Landlord of this issue in writing on February 28, 2024. The Tenants testified that the Landlord never repaired this issue during their tenancy.
36. The Landlord testified that he did not ignore the issue of the upstairs water leak and scheduled contractors to do the work on September 24, 2024, but he was unable to do so, because the Tenants contacted the police department and had the Landlord and his contractor leave the property. The Landlord also testified that the Tenants did not feel comfortable having the walls removed in the bathroom. The Landlord completed the repairs required after the Tenants vacated the rental unit. The Landlord did not attempt to re-schedule the work to be completed after September 24, 2024.
37. Based on the evidence, I am satisfied that the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act')., I make this finding because I find the Landlord's attempt to have the repair work carried out in September 2024, unreasonable given the fact that he was initially made aware of the issue in February 2024, and either personally attended or had someone attend the rental unit multiple times in April, May, and August 2024. The Tenants did not cooperate with the Landlord's efforts in September 2024, onward. This does not excuse the Landlord from having the repairs completed.

Mold:

38. The Tenants testified that they had black mold in their rental unit, more specifically inside of the closet in the master bedroom, cold room/storage space in the basement, on the floor in one of the bedrooms, inside another closet space, and linen closet. The Tenants had a technician attend the unit to assess the mold and found a substance that he identified as being mold and believed it may be possible that the material inside the walls may contain asbestos. The Tenants notified the Landlord of this issue in writing on February 28, 2024. The Tenants testified that the Landlord never repaired or corrected the issue.
39. The Landlord did not dispute the mold substance in the rental unit and testified that he attempted to have the mold removed and treated but the Tenants were unresponsive to his efforts. He testified in attempting to have the mold cleaned on April 3, 2025. The Landlord cleaned the mold and treated the areas on July 1, 2025, after the Tenants vacated the rental unit.
40. Based on the evidence, I am satisfied that the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act')., I make this finding because I find the Landlord's attempt to have the repair work carried out in April 2025, unreasonable given the fact that he was initially made aware of the issue in February 2024, and either personally attended or had someone attend the rental unit multiple times in April, May, and August 2024. I do not have any evidence to support that the Tenants prevented the Landlord from carrying out the necessary repairs.

Deck stairs and railing:

41. The Tenants testified that the steps leading to the deck and back entry of the rental unit were rotten, decaying, and uneven. The Tenants also testified that the railing for the deck stairs was loosely attached and required securing or replacement. The Tenants testified that the Landlord did have someone attend to the issue but only replaced one of the several steps that required replacement and never returned. When the Tenants informed the Landlord that the whole staircase required replacing, the Landlord stated that his contractor said it was safe and could survive another few years the way it was. The Tenants notified the Landlord of this issue on February 28, 2024, by email communication.
42. The Landlord testified that he had a contractor or handyman attend the rental unit on April 14, 2024. The Landlord agreed that he did not replace the entire stairway but argued that the stairway did not require replacement and that the replacement of the one step was sufficient. The Landlord did not replace or repair the railing because the Tenants did not make him aware of the issue. He also does not believe the issue was existent at that time because his contractor would have secured the railing.
43. Based on the evidence, I am satisfied that the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'). I make this finding because the Landlord's response time in repairing the steps was approximately 1.5 months after being initially notified of the issue which is not reasonable given a Landlord's obligations under the Act. I do however find the Landlord's actions of repairing the one step to be sufficient, as I have no evidence before me to suggest that the remaining steps failed or malfunctioned during the remainder of the tenancy.

Backyard sod/mud:

44. The Tenants noticed that a large portion of their backyard had lost all its grass and became very muddy when it rained. The Tenants notified the Landlord of this concern and requested that the Landlord resod the area so that the Tenants can have grass in that part of the yard. The Tenants also notified the Landlord that the home did not have an outdoor water hose connection or faucet and requested the Landlord install a connection. The Tenants testified that the Landlord did not resod the backyard or install a water faucet outside. The Tenants tendered photographs of the backyard area as evidence.
45. The Landlord testified that he was willing to sod the backyard and have the area grassy for the Tenants. The Landlord ordered the sod sometime in May 2024, due to the availability and season for sod, but the Tenants informed the Landlord that the home had no outdoor water supply or hose attachment, and the sod would simply die as it could not be maintained. The Tenants sent the Landlord an email to this effect on or about May 25, 2024. The same email also specifies the Tenants being concerned with the walls being opened, and the excessive noise from construction work due to one of the Tenant's medical conditions.

46. Based on the evidence, I am not satisfied that the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'). I am making this finding because I find the delay in ordering sod in May to be reasonable given the type of product that is required and its availability. I also find the Landlord's response to the Tenants concern to be reasonable given the Tenants requested that the Landlord not install any sod as of May 2024. Therefore, I do not find it appropriate to order any compensation for this issue.

Ceiling fans in bedrooms:

47. The Tenants testified that the ceiling fans in the bedrooms only had one of the two cords required to turn on the fan and light function. Because one of the cords was missing, the Tenants had to remove the light bulb to use the fan, if they wanted to use the fan alone. The Tenants testified that the fan and light both worked but the missing cord caused a great deal of inconvenience. The Tenants notified the Landlord of this issue on February 28, 2024, by email communication. The Tenants tendered pictures of the ceiling fans as evidence. The Tenants testified that the Landlord never addressed this issue.
48. The Landlord testified to repairing the ceiling fans after the Tenants vacated the rental unit. I was not provided with any compelling evidence as to why this repair could not have been done during the Landlord's multiple visits in 2024.
49. Therefore, I find that the Landlord has failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'). The Landlord was notified of this issue in February 2024.

Windows, window screens, and door:

50. The Tenants testified that they observed multiple windows in the rental unit that were missing screens or had ripped screens. The Tenants also testified that multiple windows were not properly sealed and caused a significant draft and increase in utility costs. The Tenants testified that some of the windows were jammed or gummed up and would not allow the Tenants to lock the windows when closed. The Tenants also testified that the windows not being properly sealed resulted in bugs and insects entering the rental unit. The Tenants tendered pictures of the windows, and window screens as evidence.
51. The Tenants testified that the front entry door had a large visible gap in it when the door was completely closed. The Tenants testified that the gap in the door allowed drafts through the home, as well as being less secure. The Tenants notified the Landlord of this issue by email on February 28, 2024. The Tenants testified that the issues were never addressed by the Landlord.
52. The Landlord testified that that he did not ignore the issue of the windows and door, and scheduled contractors do the work on September 24, 2024, but he was unable to do so, because the Tenants contacted the police department and had the Landlord and his contractor leave the property. The Landlord is currently in the process of having the work completed. The Landlord did not attempt to re-schedule the work to be completed after September 24, 2024.

53. Based on the evidence, I am satisfied that the Landlord failed to meet the Landlord's maintenance obligations under the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act')., I make this finding because I find the Landlord's attempt to have the repair work carried out in September 2024, unreasonable given the fact that he was initially made aware of the issue in February 2024, and either personally attended or had someone attend the rental unit multiple times in April, May, and August 2024. The Tenants did not cooperate with the Landlord's efforts in September 2024, onward. This does not excuse the Landlord from having the repairs completed.
54. The Tenants testified that the Landlord did repair the basement bathroom fan and kitchen plug on September 5, 2024, and repaired the broken breaker fuse panel on September 30, 2024.
55. The Tenants sought a rent abatement in the amount of 30% and/or \$8,820.00 for the period of twelve months from February 2024, through to February 2025, \$150.00 for out-of-pocket expenses for mold testing, \$2,500.00 in general compensation for mental and emotional duress.
56. Based on the evidence and the circumstances, I find that it is appropriate to award the Tenants the sum of \$7,350.00, a rent abatement in the amount of 25% of the monthly rent for the period of March 1, 2024, through to February 28, 2025. I find that the reduction from the Tenants' request of 30% to be reasonable because the Tenants were not cooperative in September 2024, and onwards. I do not find the Tenants' position to be unreasonable given the number of entries the Landlord made prior to that date, and the amount of work that was completed during those visits. Having said this, I find that the Tenants' reluctance and resistance in allowing entry would have impeded the Landlord's ability to carry out the repairs in a timely manner. This does not excuse the unreasonable delay between the time that the Landlord was initially notified of the maintenance issues to the time of the Landlord attending and repairing the issues.
57. I also find it is appropriate to award the Tenants the sum of \$150.00 for out-of-pocket expenses for the cost of having the unit inspected for mold.
58. Despite the issues between the parties and their feelings towards one another, I find that most of the issues and problems that arise in this case could have easily been avoided by better communication and organization of inspections and repairs. I am not satisfied that the Landlord intentionally or wilfully attended the property to upset the Tenants or harass them. I do not find it probable that someone would travel from Toronto to Sudbury, with the sole intent of causing someone a hard time. I believe the Landlord's intentions were good, but he did not act within a reasonable time, nor did he effectively communicate with his Tenants. Therefore, I find that general compensation would not be appropriate in these circumstances.

Remedies

59. Therefore, I find that a rent abatement of \$7,350.00 is appropriate in the circumstances for the maintenance issues as described in the T6 application.
60. The Tenants incurred out-of-pocket expenses because of the Landlord's breach:
Therefore, the Landlord must pay the Tenants \$150.00 for these out-of-pocket expenses.
61. The Landlord shall pay the Tenants \$650.00 for the Landlord's conduct regarding the illegal entries and substantial interference as described in the T2 application.

It is ordered that:

1. The total amount the Landlord shall pay the Tenants is \$8,198.00. This amount represents:
 - \$8,000.00 for a rent abatement.
 - \$150.00 for out-of-pocket expenses.
 - \$48.00 for the cost of filing the application.
2. The Landlord shall pay the Tenants the full amount owing by June 21, 2026.
3. If the Landlord does not pay the Tenants the full amount owing by June 21, 2026, the Landlord will owe interest. This will be simple interest calculated from June 22, 2026, at 4.00% annually on the balance outstanding.
4. The Tenants have the right, at any time, to collect the full amount owing or any balance outstanding under this order.

June 10, 2026
Date Issued

Ilan Shingait
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.