



Order under Section 21.2 of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act and the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

Citation: Schacter v Nano Velarde AKA Christina Nano, 2026 ONLTB 46742

Date: 2026-06-11

File Number: LTB-L-013532-26-RV

In the matter of: 810, 9191 YONGE ST
RICHMOND HILL ON L4C1E2

Between: Robert Schacter Landlord

And

Chris Natalaies Nano Velarde AKA Christina Nano Tenant

Review Order

Robert Schacter (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Chris Natalaies Nano Velarde AKA Christina Nano (the 'Tenant') because:

- the Tenant, another occupant of the rental unit or someone the Tenant permitted in the residential complex has substantially interfered with the reasonable enjoyment or lawful right, privilege or interest of the Landlord or another tenant.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-013532-26 issued on June 1, 2026.

On June 10, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing.

Determinations:

1. Tenant submits they were not reasonably able to participate at the hearing the took place on May 19, 2026.
2. For clarity, the Tenant attended on May 19, 2026, and the parties, before a Dispute Resolution Officer (DRO), resolved the application by way of a consent. The Tenant fully engaged their right to participate at the hearing and the DRO was satisfied the Tenant understood the consequences of the consent. It therefore cannot be said that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate at the hearing.
3. In the review request, the Tenant does not state any serious errors with the order. Rather, the Tenant expresses regret for having agreed to the terms of the June 1, 2026 order.

4. The order under review was made on consent of the parties. The order reflects the terms to which the parties agreed on May 19, 2026. The agreed terms include the amount owed by the Tenant as reflected in the order.
5. The Divisional Court has stated that “parties ought not to be easily able to revisit Board orders that have been made on consent. The effective resolution of matters that come before the Board will be greatly impaired if parties can continually seek to revisit issues that they have earlier agreed to resolve.” (*Trust Construction Corporation v. McKie*, 2017 ONSC 4702)
6. The Divisional Court also stated that “The policy of the courts is to promote settlement. The discretion to refuse to enforce a settlement should be exercised rarely...agreements, and joint submissions, are serious and they should not be easy to simply overturn. To allow parties, after the fact, to raise claims they could have or allow second thoughts after an agreement is struck would cause unnecessary waste on our Tribunals and Courts. No one, even with an order, would feel safe to rely on what has been agreed to. This would not be a just result.” (*Gent v. IMH Pool III LP*, 2017 ONSC 7230 CanLII)
7. The review request does not provide a sufficient reason to revisit the consent order.
8. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order or that a serious error occurred in the proceedings or that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-013532-26 issued on June 1, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

June 11, 2026
Date Issued

Dana Wren
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.