



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

**Citation:** TAWIL v KLASSEN, 2026 ONLTB 47172

**Date:** 2026-06-15

**File Number:** LTB-L-025406-26-RV

**In the matter of:** Upper, 3 SATINWOOD CRES  
LEAMINGTON ON N8H4P1

**Between:** Pierre TAWIL Landlord  
Vicki TAWIL

**And**

Daniel LOEWEN KLASSEN Tenants  
Anna KLASSEN

### **Review Order**

Pierre TAWIL and Vicki TAWIL (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Daniel LOEWEN KLASSEN and Anna KLASSEN (the 'Tenants') because the Tenants did not pay the rent that the Tenants owe.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-025406-26, issued on June 3, 2026.

On June 12, 2026, the Tenants requested a review of the order.

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

### **Reasons:**

1. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Tenants were not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.
2. Mr. Klassen asserts that he was unable to attend the hearing because he was obligated to go to work that day. The LTB expects parties to prioritize legal proceedings. However, if Mr. Klassen was not able to attend, he could have filed a request to reschedule the hearing, or asked someone to attend the hearing on his behalf to request an adjournment. Instead, he simply skipped the hearing. I am not satisfied that he was not reasonably able to participate, given his failure to take any steps to reschedule or adjourn the hearing to a date that he could attend.
3. Ms. Klassen asserts that she was unable to attend because she was taking care of the Tenants' two-year-old child. She too did not file a request to reschedule the hearing, or ask someone to attend and request an adjournment. Further, childcare obligations would

not reasonably have prevented her from logging into a videoconference hearing, if only for the purpose of requesting an adjournment. Parties routinely appear before the LTB while caring for children.

4. The Tenants also argue that Member erred by accepting the Landlord's evidence that they did not have a rent deposit, when in fact they did have a rent deposit. If the Tenants wanted to present evidence to show that they had a deposit, they should have attended the hearing. The Member did not err by deciding the case on the evidence before her.
5. I am satisfied that the Tenants would have reasonably been able to participate in the hearing, but chose not to. The review will be denied.

**It is ordered that:**

1. The request to review order LTB-L-025406-26, issued on June 3, 2026, is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

**June 15, 2026**  
**Date Issued**

---

**Dale Whitmore**  
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.