



Order under Sections 30 and 31 Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Tulloch v Tomlinson, 2026 ONLTB 39430

Date: 2026-06-15

File Number: LTB-T-062022-24

In the matter of: 149A PUMPKIN POINT ROAD EAST
ECHO BAY ON P0S1C0

Between: Sierra Tulloch Tenant

And

Judith Tomlinson Landlord

Sierra Tulloch (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Judith Tomlinson (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 (the 'T6 Application').

The Tenant also applied for an order determining that the Landlord:

- substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment of the rental unit or residential complex by the Tenant or by a member of their household;
- harassed, obstructed, coerced, threatened or interfered with the Tenant; and
- withheld or interfered with their vital services or care services and meals in a care home (the 'T2 application').

This combined application was heard by videoconference on April 2, 2026, and May 14, 2026.

The Tenant and the Landlord attended the hearing. On April 2, 2026, the Tenant consulted with Tenant Duty Counsel prior to the commencement of the hearing. The Landlord was represented by Nathan Chevalier.

Determinations:

1. This application is about a rural one and a half storey farmhouse that was built in the early 1900s. the Tenant and her family moved into it on January 1, 2022. The Tenant's now former partner moved out in September of 2023, and the tenancy continued with the Tenant as the sole tenant. The Tenant and her children continued to live in the rental unit until the Landlord succeeded in obtaining an eviction order from the Board for demolition. (See Board order LTB-L-028175-25 issued November 4, 2025.) The Tenant returned

vacant possession of the unit to the Landlord on or before December 1, 2025, and it was demolished sometime between April 2, 2026 and May 14, 2026.

2. The bulk of the Tenant's application concerns disrepair. With some exceptions noted below, the Landlord does not deny that the rental unit was in a state of disrepair. She says that the disrepair was so extensive she could not afford to do many of the necessary repairs, so a few months into the tenancy she served the first of a number of notices of termination for demolition.
3. The T2 Application is somewhat duplicative in that it addresses the lack of heat issue, snow removal and yard maintenance which are covered by the T6 Application, but it also alleges the Landlord breached the Act with respect to attempts to evict the Tenant and refusing to allow the Tenant to put hydro in her name as stipulated in the tenancy agreement.
4. For the reasons set out below, the Tenant's T2 Application is denied, the T6 Application is granted in part and denied in part, and the Landlord is ordered to pay to the Tenant a total of \$12,800.00 for abatement of the rent, general compensation and out of pocket expenses.

THE T2 APPLICATION

5. As I explained at the hearing, much of the Tenant's T2 Application is out of time.
6. Pursuant to s. 29(2) of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'), no application can be made under s. 29(1) more than one year after the day the alleged conduct giving rise to the application occurred. On a T6 application the alleged conduct giving rise to the application is a landlord's failure to effect repair, so the one-year limitation period does not start to run until the landlord does the repair. In contrast, a T2 application is about specific incidents that occur at identifiable points in time, so the Board has no jurisdiction to grant remedies with respect to incidents alleged that occurred more than one year prior to the filing of the tenant's application.
7. The application here was filed with the Board on July 25, 2024.
8. The T2 Application complains the Landlord served multiple notices of termination for demolition and attempted or threatened to change the locks on the termination dates in the notices. All of the notices complained of in the T2 Application except one were served on the Tenant prior to July 25, 2023, so are beyond the Board's jurisdiction. The one mentioned in the application that was issued during the period over which the Board has jurisdiction was issued on October 12, 2023. That was a notice of termination for demolition.
9. It is not harassment to issue a notice of termination to a tenant in good faith. Given that the Landlord did in fact demolish the rental unit once she obtained vacant possession it cannot be said the notice of termination in question was not issued in good faith. With respect to the threats to change the locks, the application fails to provide an in-time date for any such activity.

10. So the parts of the T2 Application that concern the notices of termination and attempts to change the locks are dismissed.
11. The T2 Application also complains that the tenancy agreement between the parties says that hydro was the Tenant's responsibility and the account was to be put in the name of the Tenant's former partner. According to the Tenant, her former partner did not put the account in his name at the beginning of the tenancy because there were outstanding electrical issues at the time that they were waiting to be fixed. So the Tenant would get the hydro bill from the Landlord and remit payment to her.
12. The Tenant's former partner moved out in September of 2023. At some point after that the Tenant contacted Algoma Power about putting the account into her name and received a text confirming that the Landlord did not want the account transferred out of her name at that time. That text appears to be dated January 15th but no year is provided. Given the surrounding evidence, and lack of testimony to the contrary, I believe this denial occurred in January of 2024, which is basically just after the Tenant became the tenant of the rental unit and within the one-year limitation period over which the Board has jurisdiction.
13. The Tenant says this repudiation of the lease clause that said the hydro account was to be in the Tenant's name impacted her negatively because it was a lost opportunity to build a credit record. With a better credit record she might have been able to find another place to live or even buy a property.
14. The difficulty that arises with this part of the T2 Application is that it is based on the right set out in section 22 which says:

A landlord shall not at any time during a tenant's occupancy of a rental unit and before the day on which an order evicting the tenant is executed **substantially interfere with the reasonable enjoyment** of the rental unit or the residential complex in which it is located for all usual purposes by a tenant or members of his or her household.

[Emphasis added.]

15. Given the speculative and conditional nature of the impact the Tenant alleges occurred (being the opportunity to build a credit rating sufficient to find alternative housing) I am not satisfied the Landlord's behaviour rises to the level of a substantial interference. It was definitely an interference as it was a lost opportunity that might have benefited the Tenant, but I am not satisfied it was a "substantial" one based on the scant evidence provided. So this part of the Tenant's T2 Application is dismissed.
16. The balance of the Tenant's T2 Application is dismissed as duplicative as it is about maintenance issues included in the T6 Application which are dealt with below: lack of heat; snow removal; and yard maintenance.
17. As a result, the T2 Application is dismissed in its entirety.

THE T6 APPLICATION

18. To summarise in my own words, the Tenant's T6 application alleges the Landlord breached s. 20(1) of the Act with respect to:

- A lack of heat, issues with the wood stove and chimney, and problems with the exterior envelope resulting in the rental unit not being weathertight and permitting entry of pests;
- Missing window screens;
- Lead paint;
- Damaged and missing doors;
- Handrails on the exterior stairs were missing or in disrepair;
- The interior stairwell had no railing and the stairs were damaged;
- Improper washing machine drainage;
- Airborne particulates of insulation, interior water damage and closet problems;
- Cabinets and drawers in the kitchen;
- Electrical issues;
- Laneway potholes, snow removal (which is mentioned in the remedies section of the T6) and yard maintenance; and
- Septic system issues.

19. No evidence was led with respect to the presence of lead paint in the rental unit so that part of the Tenant's T6 Application is dismissed for lack of evidence.

The Legal Framework

20. The T6 Application rests on the rights and responsibilities set out in s. 20(1) of the Act which says:

A landlord is responsible for providing and maintaining a residential complex, including the rental units in it, in a good state of repair and fit for habitation and for complying with health, safety, housing and maintenance standards.

21. This provision imposes three separate obligations on the Landlord: to maintain the rental unit in a good state of repair; ensure that the rental unit is fit for habitation; and comply with all health, safety and housing standards.

22. Pursuant to the Court of Appeal's decision in *Onyskiw v. CJM Property Management Ltd.*, 2016 ONCA 47 a finding of liability is not automatic for every breach of maintenance as soon as it occurs. The Board is to consider the context including the landlord's conduct and the surrounding circumstances to determine whether a breach has occurred. Pursuant to the Board's Interpretation Guideline 5 the context includes an exploration of whether the Landlord responded to the disrepair in a timely and effective manner.

23. With respect to the third of the obligations imposed by s. 20(1), the rental unit here is subject to the maintenance standards set out in Ontario Regulation 516/06 because the local township does not have a property standards by-law (see s. 224(1)(a) of the Act).

The Evidence of Breaches of s. 20(1)

24. In response to the Tenant's complaints the local township issued a Provincial Work Order on March 19, 2025. It says:

- The foundation and the roof are not weathertight;
- The foundation is deteriorating;
- The upstairs washroom door cannot be locked from the inside;
- The rental unit is not heated to 20 degrees Celsius;
- Space heaters are being used as the primary source of heat;
- The main entrance door is broken and not weathertight;
- Exterior guardrails and handrails are in disrepair or lacking;
- The interior stairs are missing the required handrail;
- The interior stairs are in disrepair and not smooth;
- The kitchen ceiling is cracking and is water damaged;
- The kitchen cabinetry is in a state of disrepair; and
- A pipe which is now capped came through into a bedroom upstairs.

25. The Tenant gave detailed evidence about the nature of the disrepair complained of (except for the allegation with respect to lead paint) and its impact on her that corroborates the contents of the Provincial Work Order and the other allegations in the application.

26. The Landlord did not lead evidence with respect to the majority of the Tenant's disrepair complaints, nor did she refute any of the breaches described in the Provincial Work Order issued on March 19, 2025. And she also does not deny the Tenant complained to her about all of the issues listed in the application.

The Insulation Issue

27. But the Landlord did testify that the insulation was never tested to determine if it was asbestos because the Tenant failed to provide an adequate sample. The Tenant denies failing to cooperate with the Landlord in providing a sample, but she did not test it either. According to the Tenant, a governmental authority told her that given the age of the building the insulation may or may not be made of a harmful material. That means I have no idea if the insulation was made of a hazardous material or not.

28. That being said, I am satisfied that insulation that is so old that it is decomposing and present as particles in the air as is the case here, is insulation that is not in a good state of repair.

Noxious Weeds

29. Pursuant to s. 26(1) of O.Reg. 517/06 the Landlord is responsible for removing "noxious weeds as defined in the regulations to the *Weed Control Act*".

30. The Landlord states that she got a letter from a by-law officer about clearing "noxious weeds" in the yard, took photographs for him and asked for more detail about the area to be cleared, but got no response.

31. The Tenant's evidence was with respect to burdock, but burdock is not a listed noxious weed in the regulations to the *Weed Control Act* and no evidence was led in support of the proposition that the plants the Tenant complains of are in fact "noxious weeds". As a result, this part of the Tenant's application must also be dismissed.

The Washing Machine

32. With respect to the drainage from the washing machine the problem is that wastewater from it drains directly to the outdoors where it can enter a nearby creek.
33. The Landlord says she got a message from an unknown source telling her the plumbing had to be re-routed. She did not comply because laundry was not included in the tenancy agreement. Neither party produced the written lease agreement.
34. But the Landlord does not dispute that the laundry machines were present and in the unit when it was rented to the Tenant and capable of being used. The reason this is important is because s. 40(1) of O.Reg. 517/06 says any appliances supplied by the Landlord shall be maintained in a good state of repair and in safe operable condition so by leaving them in the unit the Landlord became responsible for ensuring they were in a good state of repair and in compliance with all housing standards.
35. That being said, although I strongly suspect there is some legal standard that says wastewater from a washing machine must be drained into a suitable septic system, I am not aware of any specific such legal standard and no evidence was led of one at the hearing. As a result, the evidence is insufficient to establish the way the washing machine operated and drained is a breach of s. 20(1). Therefore, the Tenant's claim with respect to the drainage of the washing machine is also dismissed.

Context: Did the Landlord Respond to Complaints in a Timely and Effective Manner?

36. With respect to the other complaints raised in the T6 application, the Landlord led no evidence with respect to them. As a result, I accept the Tenant's testimony in its entirety with respect to her descriptions of the nature of the disrepair issues.
37. That means the next issue for the Board is to determine whether the Landlord responded to the Tenant's complaints of disrepair in a timely and effective manner.
38. The Landlord did do some things in response to the Tenant's complaints.
- Electrical work was done that seems to have satisfied the Tenant although it is not clear when that was. (Absent evidence as to when the issue was resolved, it is impossible to determine if the disrepair existed during the one-year period prior to the filing of the application. That means I cannot determine if this issue is within the Board's jurisdiction. As a result, no remedy shall flow to the Tenant with respect to electrical issues.)
 - The wood stove was replaced sometime in 2023, and an extension of the chimney was installed, but the Tenant continued to need to use space heaters as a primary source of heat and the lack of weathertightness of the building envelope continued.

- When the Tenant complained about snow removal from the laneway the Landlord organised someone to do it, but the Landlord could not say when that was. Based on the Tenant's evidence that was probably around December of 2024.
- In the summer of 2024, the Landlord got a local company to put some gravel down on the laneway, but it did not grade or cover the entirety of the laneway area.
- The Landlord did pump out the sewage tank on an unknown number of occasions but did not address the apparent failure of the septic bed.

39. Given all of the above I am satisfied that the rental unit was in a significant state of disrepair throughout the tenancy and the Landlord failed to respond to most of the Tenant's complaints in a timely or effective manner.
40. The Landlord's response to the Tenant's disrepair application is two-fold. The Landlord says that when she discovered the depth of the disrepair problems shortly after the Tenant moved in, she served notice to terminate on the Tenant for demolition, and the Tenant should have moved out pursuant to the notice. Further the Landlord says the nature of the disrepair complained of was such that some, if not all, of the repairs would have been beyond the Landlord's means.
41. With respect to the second of these positions, I am of the view that impecuniosity is not a defence to an application to the Board based on the rights and responsibilities set out in s. 20(1) of the Act. As set out in Interpretation Guideline 5 "Breach of Maintenance Obligations":

It is not a proper defence to such an application that the landlord needs the money for other purposes, even for other repairs. If there are many repairs necessary in a complex, the Member could take into account that some work should come first, and delay an order for other repairs. However, **the obligation to maintain residential premises is not subject to whether the landlord has available funds.**

[Emphasis added.]

42. Although the Interpretation Guidelines are not binding on me, I agree with this statement. I say this because a landlord's obligations under s. 20(1) are contractual in nature. Where there is a breach of contract, normal liability flows. If a contract cannot be fulfilled due to unforeseen outside circumstances, someone must bear the impact of that. In contract law the person who has contracted to provide something, and who now cannot do so, is the one who must suffer the loss. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Landlord's claims of limited means are not relevant to the question of whether or not the Landlord has breached s. 20(1) of the Act.
43. As for the argument that the Tenant should have moved out pursuant to the multiple notices of termination served on her, the problem with that argument is the Act enshrines the concept of security of tenure. The Tenant was entitled to live in the rental unit after notice of termination was served and after the termination date and continuing up to the date a Board order evicting her was enforced by the Court Enforcement Office (Sheriff). Further, the tenant's rights provisions in the Act continue throughout the occupancy of the

unit. They do not cease to have effect just because a notice of termination has been served.

44. During the course of giving testimony the Landlord also remarked that the Tenant was aware of some of the issues prior to entering into the tenancy agreement. The Act specifically speaks to that issue. Subsection 20(2) says the rights and obligations set out in s. 20(1) apply even if the tenant is aware of the state of non-repair or contravention of a standard before entering into the tenancy agreement.
45. During final submissions the Landlord also argued that it should be expected that a house of the age of the rental unit would have major issues. There are many homes known to me that are more than a hundred years old that are in immaculate condition. More importantly, the Act applies to every rental unit regardless of the age of the rental unit.
46. As a result of all of the above, and with the exceptions noted, I am satisfied that the Landlord breached s. 20(1) of the Act.

Remedies

47. The T6 Application seeks as remedies: abatement of the rent; compensation for damaged property; out of pocket expenses; an order for repairs, an order prohibiting a rent increase ('OPRI'); and general compensation for "stress and mental anguish and injury to ... dignity, feelings and self-respect".
48. As the tenancy has terminated and the rental unit been demolished, the requests for an order for repairs and an OPRI are now moot and shall not be ordered.
49. Abatement of rent is a contractual remedy. It is designed to address the idea that a tenant is paying for a bundle of goods and services and if the tenant is not receiving those goods and services, the rent should be abated proportionate to the difference between what the tenant is paying for and what is actually received.
50. The Board will look at a number of factors when determining quantum of abatement including but not limited to: the proportion of the rental unit affected; the length of time the disrepair was ongoing; the seriousness and nature of the disrepair; and its impact on the Tenant.
51. The period for abatement under consideration here runs from July 25, 2023 (one year prior to the date the application was filed) to December 1, 2025 (when the Tenant returned vacant possession to the Landlord). I would point out at this juncture that during final submissions the Landlord submitted that the Tenant was claiming to have moved out in September of 2025, but the Landlord was taking the position vacant possession was not returned until December 1, 2025. The Tenant in fact did not refute the tenancy terminated on December 1, 2025, which is when vacant possession was returned to the Landlord. As a result, that is the appropriate end date for any abatement claim.
52. The rent charged throughout the tenancy remained at \$800.00 a month. The T6 Application asks for abatement of the rent in the amount of \$700.00 a month.

53. During final submissions the Tenant asked that the Board focus its monetary award on the request in the application for general damages in the nature of pain and suffering. Such an award is available to the Board pursuant to s. 30(1)9, but awards for pain and suffering for breach of contract are primarily appropriate in the situation where abatement alone does not recognize the true impact on the Tenant and her household with respect to the breach in question.
54. It seems to me that the Tenant's complaints with respect to lack of heat, the lack of hand railings and disrepair to the stairs, are complaints appropriately addressed with an award for general damages. I say this because it is the uncontested evidence before the Board that the Tenant has a medical condition called postural orthostatic tachycardia syndrome ('POTS') which she told the Landlord about when she and her former partner were viewing the unit prior to renting it. They specifically discussed the need for hand railings which were missing from the interior stairs and wobbly or missing on the exterior stairs. The reason this is important is that because of her condition the Tenant is prone to fainting. Flare ups of her condition occur from stress or environmental factors like insufficient heat which causes difficulties with body temperature regulation and blood pressure dysregulation. This means that the Tenant was differentially impacted by the lack of heat, the disrepair to the stairs and the lack of railings due to her disability. I am therefore satisfied that abatement would not compensate her adequately for those impacts so the claims related to those disrepair items shall be excluded from the calculation of the abatement and dealt with by an award for damages for pain and suffering instead.
55. With respect to abatement of the rent, the Tenant was not receiving all of the goods and services being paid for throughout the relevant period.
56. There were vermin. The foundation was crumbling, at least one basement window was broken and there were multiple points of entry for vermin to enter which they did. The Tenant put out traps which caught mice, rats and weasels. The rodents would run up the walls and could be heard chewing things.
57. The wind lifted roofing nails resulting in leaking during rain in the mudroom and damage to the fascia which was also an entry point for vermin. The mudroom door was damaged and not weathertight. Rain and snow would penetrate five to six feet into the house.
58. The ceiling was water damaged in the kitchen and was opened when the pipes burst and never fixed. The kitchen cabinetry included a cracked cabinet door and drawer that did not close properly.
59. There was an open hole in a bedroom floor where a cook stove pipe had been removed. The Tenant and her former partner taped it up to prevent the particles of insulation from entering. None of the bedrooms had doors.
60. The laneway to the rental unit was shared by the Landlord, the Tenant, and the cell tower company that rented land from the Landlord. It also functioned as the Tenant's driveway. The surface of the laneway was potholed and the culverts were damaged leaving sharp edges.
61. The lease agreement between the parties says the Tenant could use the tractor to remove snow if the Landlord was able to provide parts so it could be repaired. The Landlord

determined providing parts and repairing the tractor was not feasible, so the tractor was never repaired. And pursuant to O.Reg. 516/07 s. 26(1)5 it was the Landlord's responsibility to clear any unsafe accumulations of ice and snow.

62. The windows lacked screens, and if they were open the falling insulation would enter so the Tenant did not open them in the summer.
63. The property was served by a septic system. There was an access point to the septic system close to the house that had a wooden lid on it. Every spring that lid would be floating due to raw sewage escaping from the system. Sometimes it happened more than once a year. The Landlord would have someone pump out the septic tank but that did not address whatever problem was causing the septic system to malfunction in this manner. As a result, the Tenant did not let her children or the dog play in that part of the yard.
64. Behind the dining room was a closet that had a trap door leading to the basement. It was unlit and unventilated and covered with a black substance that smelt bad. The Tenant did not use it and as her ten year old has asthma, had an air cleaning system for her bedroom.
65. As can be seen from the narrative above, even excluding the issue of lack of heat and the stair and handrail issues, the disrepair to the rental unit was not insignificant. Given the nature of the disrepair, the impacts on the Tenant and her family, the seasonal or occasional nature of some of the disrepair problems complained of, the Landlord's effort to remedy the snow removal issues late in the tenancy, and my knowledge of similar like cases, it seems to me a reasonable abatement of the rent would be about 25% of the rent charged for the relevant period which I fix at \$5,600.00.
66. That brings me to the claim for damages for pain and suffering for the lack of heat issue and the condition of the railings and stairs.
67. Sometime in July of 2023 the Landlord replaced the wood stove and after that the chimney flue was lengthened. Given the totality of the evidence before me, I do not believe there was anything wrong with the stove. Rather, the rental unit was so lacking in proper insulation and weathertightness that it was impossible to heat the rental unit adequately with just the one wood stove. At the beginning of the tenancy the Landlord supplied some space heaters. At some point in time two of them caught fire and the others stopped working, so the Tenant replaced them herself.
68. Despite the wood stove and multiple space heaters, during the winter the rental unit was frequently cold. Multiple screen shots of temperature readings and the Provincial Work Order corroborate that.
69. Because of the cold in the winter, the Tenant's children would keep their winter coats on, and crawl into bed with her at night. They told her they felt like they were camping. Approximately twice a week they would bathe elsewhere because of the cold in the bathroom and once a week the Tenant would go to the local swimming pool and shower there.
70. The cold meant the pipes were in danger of freezing so she had to let water drip constantly and use a blow dryer to prevent the pipes from freezing. That meant leaving home for any length of time was stressful. In January of 2025 the pipes burst.

71. With respect to the interior handrailing for the stairs, the Tenant told the Landlord when viewing the unit that she her condition means she faints quite often so she asked that the missing railing be replaced. It never was, so for both herself and her children, using the stairs was stressful. The children had to go down them on their bottoms. The exterior stairs were very steep and there should have been railings on both sides but there were not. The only section of railing present was wobbly and unsafe. The Tenant refused to let the children play there.
72. Given the seriousness of the problems associated with the lack of heat and the missing and unsafe hand railings, the particular vulnerability of the Tenant because of her disability, and taking into account that the heat issue was only relevant for half of each year, along with my knowledge of similar like cases, it seems to me a reasonable award for general compensation would be \$6,000.00.
73. That leaves the claims for out of pocket expenses and damaged property.
74. The damaged property is a reference to a truck the Tenant was driving that had to be towed from the laneway and repaired in September of 2023. The Tenant blames the disrepair to the truck on the potholes in the laneway but she also says the mechanic told her the damage was likely caused by potholes and "wear and tear". The vehicle was more than ten years old and had 100,000 kilometers on it. The receipt the Tenant located prior to the second hearing date did not describe the damage or its likely cause.
75. Although I would agree with the Tenant that the potholes on the laneway may well have caused or contributed to the truck breaking down, the Tenant's evidence does not meet the burden of proof. The evidence must establish that it is more likely than not that the state of disrepair to the laneway caused the disrepair to the truck. Given the lack of evidence from a qualified mechanic, or information about driving habits and other roads regularly used, or the state of maintenance of the vehicle, the evidence does not rise to the level of proof necessary. As a result, that claim must be denied.
76. The application also claims \$3,400.00 for out of pocket expenses for snow removal, laundromat costs, extra wood and rubber boots.
77. No evidence was led at the hearing with respect to these claims except for the snow removal costs.
78. With respect to snow removal, the Tenant says in November and December of 2023 the Tenant paid \$150.00 on eight occasions to have the laneway snow removed. The Tenant produced no receipts but the Landlord also did not contest this evidence of the Tenant's in any way and the cost claimed seems reasonable to me given the length of the laneway in question. As a result an order shall issue requiring the Landlord to reimburse the Tenant \$1,200.00 for out of pocket expenses arising from the Landlord's breach.
79. Given all of the above, the Tenant's application is granted in part and denied in part. The Landlord is ordered to pay to the Tenant a total of \$12,800.00.
80. This order contains all of the reasons for the decision within it. No further reasons shall be issued.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlord shall pay to the Tenant \$12,800.00, which represents:
 - \$5,600.00 for abatement of the rent;
 - \$6,000.00 for general compensation; and
 - \$1,200.00 for out of pocket expenses.
2. The Landlord shall pay the Tenant the full amount owing by June 26, 2026.
3. If the Landlord does not pay the Tenant the full amount owing by June 26, 2026, the Landlord will owe interest. This will be simple interest calculated from June 27, 2026 at 4.00% annually on the balance outstanding.
4. The Tenant has the right, at any time, to collect the full amount owing or any balance outstanding under this order.

June 15, 2026
Date Issued

Ruth Carey
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.