



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

Citation: Luo v Makvandia, 2026 ONLTB 48920

Date: 2026-06-19

File Number: LTB-T-024972-26-RV

In the matter of: 85 ROCHESTER AVE
TORONTO ON M4N1N7

Between: Ji Luo Tenant

And

Khosrow Makvandia Landlord

Review Order

Ji Luo (the 'Tenant') applied for an order determining that Khosrow Makvandia (the 'Landlord') collected or retained money illegally.

This application was resolved by order LTB-T-024972-26 issued on June 8, 2026 pursuant to a hearing held on May 13, 2026 at which only the Tenant, the Tenant's Legal Representative, Jiangning Guo, and Haoming Lei, an interpreter for the Tenant, attended.

On June 19, 2026, the Landlord requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. The Landlord submits they were not reasonably able to participate in the hearing as their son was hospitalized at the time of the hearing and they were required to be there to support their son.
2. In support of this submission, the Landlord provides a doctor's note and an affidavit of the Landlord in regard to the circumstances. The doctor's note specifies that the Landlord's son was under medical care during the period surrounding May 13, 2026, including hospitalization. It does not specify any diagnosis or details as to when or for what duration the Landlord's son was hospitalized.
3. The affidavit states the Landlord's son was hospitalized at the time of the hearing. However, it also does not specify a diagnosis, when the hospitalization commenced, or the duration of the hospitalization.

4. Neither the affidavit nor the medical note specify whether there was an emergency event that led to the Landlord's required presence at the hospital on May 13, 2026, or if these medical issues were of a more non-emergent and long-term nature on the date of the hearing, May 13, 2026.
5. While the affidavit states that the Landlord was under significant emotion stress and focused on obtaining medical care for his son, it at no point states that the Landlord was unaware of the hearing. In fact, it implies the opposite. It states that the Landlord did not have proper access to their records, communications and hearing materials and therefore was unable to adequately prepare for or attend the hearing. This implies that the Landlord remained aware of the hearing, but chose not to attend in the circumstances due to their unideal access to documents in their current circumstances.
6. No explanation is provided as to why the Landlord could not have attended the hearing by phone or video-conference, or requested someone to attend on their behalf, in order to request an adjournment of the hearing due to their family circumstances, even if the Landlord believed they could not adequately participate on the hearing date.
7. Rule 26.8.e. of the Board's Rules of Procedure states that a request to review an order must provide sufficient information to support a preliminary finding that they were not reasonably able to participate in the hearing. I find that this request does not provide sufficient information to make that preliminary finding.
8. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Landlord was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-T-024972-26 issued on June 8, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

June 19, 2026
Date Issued

Benjamin Seigel
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.