



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

Citation: Wang v Hughes, 2026 ONLTB 48856

Date: 2026-06-19

File Number: LTB-L-022195-26-RV

In the matter of: 201 LOURDES ST
WATERLOO ON N2L1N8

Between:	Yanwei Wang	Landlord
	And	
	Steven Hughes	Tenant

Review Order

Yanwei Wang (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Steven Hughes (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-022195-26 issued on May 20, 2026. Neither the Landlord nor the Tenant attended the hearing, as a result, the application was dismissed as abandoned.

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

A preliminary review of the review request was completed without a hearing. In determining this request, I reviewed the materials in the LTB's file.

Determinations:

1. The review request alleges that the Landlord was not reasonably able to participate in the May 13, 2026 proceeding.
2. 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.
3. The Landlord submits that she was prepared to proceed with the merits of the application. However, at approximately 11:00 a.m., she received an urgent work call requiring her assistance until approximately 3:00 p.m. As a result, she forgot about the scheduled hearing and did not attend.
4. While I am mindful that being reasonably able to participate must be interpreted broadly, I am not satisfied that the Landlord was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding. The Landlord was aware of the hearing and made the conscious decision to

address a work issue rather than attend the hearing. In doing so, the Landlord prioritized the work issue over the LTB proceeding. While I am sympathetic to the circumstances faced by the Landlord, that choice does not establish grounds for review.

5. My finding is consistent with the Board's approach in the following cases in which choosing to attend work rather than attending a hearing was found not to be grounds for review: *TEL-82989-17-RV (Re)*, 2017 CanLII 84863 (ON LTB), *TSL-75156-16-RV (Re)*, 2017 CanLII 28808 (ON LTB), and *TNL-56542-14-RV (Re)*, 2014 CanLII 57970 (ON LTB).
6. Additionally, the Divisional Court has affirmed that parties are required to exercise due diligence in dealing with legal proceedings and a party's failure to do so is not a reasonable basis for rehearing the application (*Q Res IV Operating GP Inc. v. Berezovs'ka*, 2017 ONSC 5541 CanLII (Div. Ct.)).
7. In *Berezovs'ka*, at para. 8, the Court noted that:

If parties are not diligent in dealing with legal proceedings then they cannot demand that a Tribunal waste its resources by rehearing matters a second time. To allow this would undermine the ability of the administration of justice to deliver timely, cost-effective and final orders.

8. The Landlord did not exercise due diligence to ensure her attendance at the hearing. For these reasons, I am not satisfied that the Landlord was not reasonably able to participate in the proceedings.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-022195-26 issued on May 20, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

June 19, 2026
Date Issued

Mayra Sawicki
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.