



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

Citation: Feng Chen v Dong, 2026 ONLTB 45570
File Number: LTB-T-094904-24-RV

In the matter of: 2209, 898 PORTAGE PKY
CONCORD ON L4K0J6

Between: Jung Wei Misael Feng Chen Tenants
Jeanfranco Fung Zheng

And

You Dong Landlord

Review Order

Jung Wei Misael Feng Chen and Jeanfranco Fung Zheng (the 'Tenants') applied for an order determining that You Dong (the 'Landlord'):

- Collected or retained money illegally (T1 application).
- gave a notice of termination in bad faith (T5 application).

This combined T1/T5 application was resolved by order LTB-T-094904-24 issued on September 9, 2025.

On September 15, 2025, the Landlord requested a review of the order and that the order be stayed until the request to review the order is resolved.

On September 29, 2025 interim order LTB-T-094904-24-RV-IN was issued, staying the order issued on September 9, 2025.

On December 2, 2025, [interim] order LTB-T-094904-24-RV [IN2] was issued granting the request for review and directing the application to be reheard.

This application was reheard by videoconference on January 22, 2026 and April 7, 2026.

The Tenants' Legal Representative, T. Chan, the Tenants, Jung Wei Misael Feng Chen (MFC) and Jeanfranco Fung Zheng (JFZ), the Landlord's Legal Representative, Y. Wang, and the Landlord, attended the hearing.

The following witness testified at the hearing:
Justin Liang (JL), third tenant at rental unit, on behalf of Landlord.

Determinations:

T5 application

1. As explained below, the Tenants proved the allegations contained in the application on a balance of probabilities. Therefore, the Landlord shall pay \$18,500.77 to the Tenants and an administrative fine of \$10,000.00 to the LTB on or before July 4, 2026.
2. This tenancy commenced on September 1, 2023 for a fixed term ending on August 31, 2024 at a monthly rent of \$3,050.00 due payable on the 1st day of each month. The parties signed a Residential Tenancy Agreement (Standard Form Lease) (the 'Agreement'), a copy of which was provided into evidence (DOC-7164314pg1).
3. This application was filed pursuant to subsection 57(1)(a) of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act') which requires the Tenants to prove each of the following on a balance of probabilities:
 - a) The Landlord gave the Tenants an N12 notice of termination (N12 Notice) under section 48 of the Act;
 - b) The Tenants vacated the rental unit as a result of the N12 Notice;
 - c) No person referred to in subsection 48(1) of the Act occupied the rental unit within a reasonable time after the Tenants vacated; and
 - d) The Landlord served the N12 Notice in bad faith.

(a) Did the Landlord give a N12 Notice pursuant to section 48 of the Act?

4. Subsections 48(1) and (2) of the Act provides that:
 - (1) A landlord may, by notice, terminate a tenancy if the landlord in good faith requires possession of the rental unit for the purpose of residential occupation for a period of at least one year by,
 - (a) the landlord;
 - (b) the landlord's spouse;
 - (c) a child or parent of the landlord or the landlord's spouse; or
 - (d) a person who provides or will provide care services to the landlord, the landlord's spouse, or a child or parent of the landlord or the landlord's spouse, if the person receiving the care services resides or will reside in the building, related group of buildings, mobile home park or land lease community in which the rental unit is located.
 - (2) The date for termination specified in the notice shall be at least 60 days after the notice is given and shall be the day a period of the tenancy ends or, where the tenancy is for a fixed term, the end of the term.
5. There was no dispute that the Landlord, on or about June 12, 2024, reached out to the Tenants through their group chat to see if the Tenants wanted to extend their tenancy

(DOC-7164314pg19). The Tenants responded that they are still discussing it, but would let the Landlord know soon. The Landlord responded as follows:

“Ok no problem. Just want to let you guys know as it stands right now I’m planning to use the property for myself after September so won’t be able to continue the lease. If you guys really want to keep living there I can see what I can do but I can’t guarantee.”

6. MFC stated that the Landlord then attended the rental unit on a Sunday night, June 23, 2024, and provided them with an Agreement to End the Tenancy (N11 Form) which MFC stated at the time he thought it was the correct form to sign. MFC also stated that the Landlord came at night around 9:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and told them to just sign the N11 which gave them no time to speak with anyone or seek legal advice. MFC maintained that he had no reason to move out and that it would only be because the Landlord wanted the unit for his own use. A copy of the N11 Form was provided into evidence (DOC-7164314pg39-40). The N11 Form is signed by the parties on June 23, 2024 and provided a termination date of August 31, 2024.
7. Under cross-examination, MFC confirmed that there was a possibility that they were not going to continue the tenancy but he does not remember why although they were discussing it amongst themselves. Under cross-examination, MFC also stated that the Landlord did not provide a reason for coming to the unit that Sunday night but they were not expecting any letter, and that he felt urged to sign the N11 when the Landlord gave it to them as the Landlord is the owner and had the power.
8. The Landlord stated that on June 7, 2024, he discovered that his in-laws were coming to Canada on August 31, 2024. In support, he provided a copy of text messages between his in-laws and himself (DOC-7128456pg1-2). The certified translation of this conversation is found on page 2 and the relevant portion read as follows:

You Dong: “Mom, we will book an Aug 31st flight ticket for you and Dad. Is that OK?”

You Dong: “When you and Dad arrive, you can stay in my condo in Vaughan.”

TianJie: “OK”

TianJie: “Did you talk to the tenants?”

You Dong: “I will talk to them and tell them I need the unit back for you to live in.”

TianJie: “By the way, is our return flight in October 2025?”

You Dong: “yes, rest assured, if you guys can’t get used to life here, we will see”

9. The Landlord also stated that on June 12, 2024, he told the Tenants about his in-laws coming to Canada and that they will stay in the unit.
10. The Landlord’s witness, Justin Liang, JL, testified that he was one of the tenants residing in the rental unit. He confirmed that the rental unit is a two bedroom plus den and that he

was occupying the den as his bedroom, which had no windows and only fit a twin bed. He recalled the Landlord's text in June 2024 asking if they were staying or not. He stated that it was discussed with his roommates (Tenants), but personally he wanted to move out as he wanted a real bedroom. With respect to the N11 Form, JL testified that he asked one of his roommates to sign for him as he had a class to attend.

11. JL also testified that after they signed the N11 Form they were looking together for another rental unit and that he found an Agent to assist them. He further confirmed that they were looking for a three bedroom unit, looked at multiple listings, each one of them gave their input on a particular unit by saying yes or no, until mid-August and after a rejection, when they all felt rushed to find something and everyone just said "yes" to anything they found. JL further testified that it was only after August 24, 2026 and another rejection that he decided to find a place on his own. In support of this he provided a copy of the Tenants' group chat messages into evidence (DOC-7164358pg1-2).
12. Under cross-examination, JL confirmed that as international students it was hard to find a new place, and that they needed to pre-pay at least half to one year of full rent to a new landlord. Also, under cross-examination, JL confirmed that he had not looked for another place on his own prior to June 2024. Further, under cross-examination, JL confirmed that it would not have been difficult for the Tenants to find another roommate and it would not have affected them if he had he just moved out. Under cross-examination, JL also confirmed that when the Landlord handed him the N11 Form, the Landlord said it was for personal use.
13. The Landlord's Legal Representative submitted that the Tenants signed the N11 Form because they wanted to terminate the lease which was supported by JL's testimony. Also, she submitted that the Tenants signed the N11 Form without hesitation and although they knew and had retained a Legal Representative in the past, who is also a Real Estate Agent, they did not contact him when they received the N11 Form.
14. The Tenants' Legal Representative submitted that the N11 Form was effectively a notice pursuant to section 48 of the Act. He submitted that the Landlord first told them in a text message that he needed the unit for personal use and then presented them with a N11 Form that provided a termination date of August 31, 2024, which was the end of their lease term. He also submitted that pursuant to section 202 of the Act, the LTB must look at the real substance of this transaction and that in [*Pinto v. Regan and White v. Regan*](#), 2021 ONSC 5502 (CanLII), (*'Pinto'*), the Divisional Court held that the LTB had a duty to consider the true nature of a transaction which in this case was having the Tenants agree to vacate without having to give the appropriate notice.
15. Subsection 202(1) of the Act provides that:

In making findings on an application, the Board shall ascertain the real substance of all transactions and activities relating to a residential complex or a rental unit and the good faith of the participants and in doing so,

(a) may disregard the outward form of a transaction or the separate corporate existence of participants; and

(b) may have regard to the pattern of activities relating to the residential complex or the rental unit.

16. Based on the evidence before me I was satisfied that the Tenants were still considering whether to continue their tenancy as per the Landlord's inquiry when the Landlord advised that he required the unit for his own use as evident by the text messages between the parties (DOC-7164314pg19) at that time. This was even supported by JL's testimony in that although he wished to end this tenancy for a better bedroom, nothing was initiated by him in support of that wish until the Landlord made the declaration that he wanted the unit for his own use and presented the Tenants with the N11 Form. Additionally, MFC maintained that he had no reason to move out of this rental unit which was also support by JL's testimony confirming that the other two tenants would have no issues finding another roommate.
17. Additionally, given JL's testimony on the difficulty they had in securing another rental unit as international students, I find it likely that the Tenants would have had a similar experience before securing this tenancy and would have been aware of this potential difficulty and additional costs of having to pay rent up front and that this would be a deterrent for them to terminate this tenancy. In any event, there was no evidence before me that all the Tenants collectively wished to terminate this tenancy or even contemplated that prior to the Landlord asking them about the renewal and making his declaration of wanting the unit for his own use.
18. In *Pinto*, that landlord had told the tenant he intended to renovate the building to build an addition on to it, and as the power and water would be shut off during construction the tenant would need to move out. That landlord also offered four months rent and the return of the final month's rent if the tenant agreed to sign a N11 Form. The Divisional Court held in *Pinto*, that section 202 of the Act imposed a statutory duty on the LTB to determine questions of fact and to apply governing principals of law to ascertain the real substance of the transaction in a landlord having a tenant agreeing to vacate the premises (N11 Form) when the landlord has not given the appropriate notice of termination under the Act.
19. Given the evidence before me, and having regard to the real substance of the transaction between the parties pursuant to section 202 of the Act, I find that the N11 Form was given to the Tenants by the Landlord to effectively have them agree to terminate the tenancy without the Landlord having to give the proper notice of termination thus avoiding his obligations at law that come with giving a proper notice for landlord's own use, such as compensation and the requirement for him or an immediate family member to occupy the rental unit for residential purposes for at least one year after the Tenants vacate. The Landlord confirmed that he also told the Tenants that his in-laws would be staying in the unit.
20. As well, although incorrect as a landlord cannot re-rent or sell a unit, the Landlord stated that he believed he could only sell the unit and not re-rent it after the Tenants vacated as per the N11 Form. This statement by the Landlord confirmed that he believed there is some obligation/deterrent when you give a tenant a notice of termination for your own use.
21. Finally, a landlord cannot escape liability because they do not provide the specific N12 Notice form to a tenant. In this case, it was clear that the Landlord's purported intention

was to terminate the tenancy for his own use, whether it was his in-laws moving in or he had some other plan. A tenancy can only be terminated by a landlord pursuant to a ground identified in the Act.

22. Consequently, I find that the Landlord's text message, his stated intent, and the service of the N11 Form on the Tenants met the requirements of a N12 Notice pursuant to section 48 of the Act. The Landlord stated he required the unit for his own use, the termination date in the N11 Form was at least 60 days after the notice was given to the Tenants, and it was for the end of the term as required by subsection 48(2) of the Act.

(b) Did the Tenants vacate the rental unit as a result of the N12 Notice?

23. There was no dispute that the Tenants vacated the rental unit on or above September 10, 2024. JL testified that he vacated the rental unit on September 1, 2024. MFC stated that they were in the process of vacating the rental unit on September 10, 2024 when the Landlord deactivated their key fobs to the premises. Additionally, the Tenants gave testimony that they were actively seeking a new rental unit after they received the N11 Form from the Landlord.

(c) Did the Landlord or his in-laws occupy the rental unit within a reasonable time after the Tenants vacated?

24. There was no dispute or evidence that either the Landlord nor his in-laws occupied the rental unit within a reasonable time after the Tenants vacated and for a period of one year. The Landlord testified that since the Tenants did not vacate until September 10, 2024, he had to find his in-laws another place to stay when they arrived in Canada at the end of August 2024. He also testified that he ended up having to rent a place from a friend for the two months that his in-laws stayed in Canada.

(d) Did the Landlord served the N12 Notice in bad faith?

25. Based on the evidence before me, I was satisfied that the N12 Notice was given to the Tenants in bad faith. The Landlord had no intention of occupying the unit himself nor did his in-laws intend to occupy the premises for at least one year. There was no dispute that his in-laws only remained in Canada for two months. I was not convinced that his in-laws plan to occupy the rental unit only changed due to the Tenants not vacating on time (end of August 2024) and that this alone caused such a rift between the Landlord and his in-laws, that his in-laws were forced to go back to China. As well, I was not convinced that the Landlord had to sell the unit due to a lack of finances.
26. There was no dispute that on September 15, 2024, the Landlord listed the rental unit for sale. A copy of the listing was provided into evidence (DOC-7164314pg29). The rental unit was subsequently sold in December 2024 or January 2025 as per the Landlord.

27. Subsection 57(5)(c) of the Act provides that:

For the purposes of an application under clause (1) (a), it is presumed, unless the contrary is proven on a balance of probabilities, that a landlord gave a notice of

termination under section 48 in bad faith, if at any time during the period described in subsection (6) the landlord,

(c) advertises the rental unit, or the building that contains the rental unit, for sale;

28. In accordance with subsection 57(5) of the Act, it is presumed that the Landlord gave the N12 Notice in bad faith since the rental unit was listed for sale within the relevant period, unless the contrary is proven on a balance of probabilities. Therefore, the onus switches to the Landlord to satisfy the LTB that the N12 Notice was not given in bad faith.
29. The Landlord stated that when his in-laws arrived on August 31, 2024 they could not stay with him as his place is only a one plus one unit which could not fit four people. He stated that they rented a friend's condominium, which he had to pay two months rent of \$4,080.00 up front, as that this was what he negotiated with his friend as September would have been a good time for his friend to rent the unit to someone else. In support, he provided a copy of the receipt for this payment dated September 1, 2024 into evidence (DOC-5973972).
30. The Landlord also stated that not knowing when the Tenants would vacate was stressful on his wife, and his in-laws were angry with him as he had not set their stay up properly, which resulted in some fighting between them. He further stated that when he went to the in-laws to tell them the Tenants had moved out they were really upset that they had already paid two months rent at the temporary place, his friend's condo.
31. The Landlord further stated that he could not afford to keep the rental unit vacant and believed that he could not re-rent the unit, but could sell it so he listed it for sale. He also stated that the unit was an investment property for him and at that time the condominium market was not good, as it took three to four months to sell the unit and he did not make any profit on the sale.
32. The Tenants were in the process of vacating the rental unit when the Landlord terminated their fobs on September 10, 2024. Given this, the Landlord had possession of the rental unit as this date. I find it unreasonable that if the Landlord's in-laws were really intending to stay in Canada (and the rental unit) that they would not have just moved into the unit when it was available. The timeframe between their arrival and the Landlord having possession of the rental unit was only ten (10) days. I find it unlikely that a large plan like staying in Canada for a year would change in this short of a timeframe regardless of the alleged breakdown in the relationship.
33. Additionally, I did not find the Landlord's evidence credible in that he could not afford to leave the rental unit vacant after September 10, 2024. While although, the Landlord asserted he paid two months rent for his in-laws to temporary house them elsewhere, he also stated that his in-laws were upset about having to pay to stay somewhere else during this time. Given this, it was not clear whether the Landlord or his in-laws paid the rent at the temporary condo. In any event, if the Landlord's assertion, and supported by the receipt entered into evidence, was that he was responsible for his in-laws housing costs then this would have been no different if they occupied the rental unit as planned. Therefore, the Landlord ought to have expected to not have an income from this property after the Tenants vacated.

34. As well, the Landlord did not provide any evidence in support that he was experiencing financial hardship at the time he listed the rental unit for sale. Therefore, I was not satisfied that the rental unit was only listed for sale as a result in a significant change in the Landlord's finances.
35. Finally, it is unlikely that the Landlord's financial issues became so significant in the timeframe in question in this matter. The Tenants were supposed to vacated August 31, 2024, the Landlord took possession on September 10, 2024 by deactivating the Tenants' key fobs, then listed the unit for sale on September 15, 2024. The entire timeframe was fifteen days. Given the above, I find it more likely than not that the Landlord's plan all along was to sell the rental unit. Therefore, I find that the N12 notice was given in bad faith.

Remedies

36. Subsection 57(3) of the Act provides the following permitted remedies:

1. An order that the landlord pay a specified sum to the former tenant for all or any portion of any increased rent that the former tenant has incurred or will incur for a one-year period after vacating the rental unit.

1.1 An order that the landlord pay a specified sum to the former tenant as general compensation in an amount not exceeding the equivalent of 12 months of the last rent charged to the former tenant. An order under this paragraph may be made regardless of whether the former tenant has incurred any actual expenses or whether an order is made under paragraph 2.

1.2 An order that the landlord pay a specified sum to the former tenant for reasonable out-of-pocket moving, storage and other like expenses that the former tenant has incurred or will incur.

2. An order for an abatement of rent.

3. An order that the landlord pay to the Board an administrative fine not exceeding the greater of \$10,000 and the monetary jurisdiction of the Small Claims Court.

4. Any other order that the Board considers appropriate.

37. At the hearing, the Tenants requested a rent abatement of \$500.00, rent difference of \$4,896.18 for the one-year period after they vacated, general compensation of \$15,000.00, and an order for the Landlord to pay an administrative fine of \$10,000.00 pursuant to an amended application served on the Landlord and filed with the LTB on December 29, 2025 (DOC-7046975). The Landlord's Legal Representative did not raise an objection to these amendments, so I was satisfied that the amendment was appropriate, did not prejudice any party and was consistent with a fair and expeditious hearing.

38. The Tenants request for an abatement of rent of \$500.00 related to an issue with an internet disruption for about 4-5 hours during their tenancy. As this issue is not related to the Landlord providing the notice in bad faith, I cannot consider this remedy.
39. The Tenants also requested \$4,896.18 as rent difference for the one-year period after they vacated due to a loss of square footage. The Tenants stated that their new rental unit was smaller two bedroom measuring only 600 square feet wherein the rental unit was a two bedroom plus den listed at 800-899 square feet as per the MLS listing. The rent at their new unit was \$2,850.00 per month.
40. Subsection 57(3) 1 of the Act provides that the LTB may issue an order for the Landlord to pay any portion of any increased rent that the former tenant has incurred or will incur for a one-year period after vacating the unit. In this case, there was no dispute that the Tenants' rent for their new unit was less than the rent at the rental. Since the Tenants have not paid any increased rent for the one-year period after vacating, this request is denied.
41. The Tenants also requested general compensation of \$15,000.00. They stated that they felt urged to find a new unit, were stressed, and lost sleep in August 2024. They also stated that they did not get their new keys until September 10, 2024, the day the Landlord deactivated their fobs. They had hoped for at least one more day to move out of the unit and into their new unit. They also stated it was harder for them as international students to find another rental unit as they are not working and do not have good credit and landlords were asking for 12 months up front which was financially hard as well. They felt deceived by the Landlord and maintained that it was very stressful for them to find another unit and move.
42. Subsection 57(3) 1.1 of the Act provides that the LTB may issue an order that the Landlord pay a specified sum to the former Tenants as general compensation in an amount not exceeding the equivalent of 12 months of the last rent charged, being \$3,050.00 multiplied by 12 equals \$36,600.00.
43. In this case, I was satisfied that the Tenants are entitled to general compensation of \$15,000.00 as claimed. This amount is less than half of the maximum claim allowable and is reasonable given that there were two Tenants and their stated circumstances. As well, in accordance with subsection 57(3) 1.1 of the Act, an order can be made regardless of whether the former Tenants incurred any actual expenses. Therefore, the Landlord shall pay to the Tenants \$15,000.00.
44. The Landlord was aware that the former Tenants were international students. Given their status, I find it very likely that they had difficulties finding a new rental unit. They testified that they had been rejected for a couple of units and in the end they had to split up to find suitable affordable units. I was satisfied that this would have caused a great amount of stress to each of the Tenants given the current rental market and them not being able to demonstrate any income and/or a credit rating. I also find it likely that they would have had to prepay rent in advance as they had to do when renting this unit from the Landlord according to their Agreement (DOC-7164314pg3).
45. The Tenants further requested that the Landlord be ordered to pay an administrative fine. Guideline 16 of the *Landlord and Tenant Board's Interpretation Guidelines* (the

'Guidelines') provides that an administrative fine is a remedy to be used by the LTB to encourage compliance with the Act and to deter landlords from engaging in similar activity in the future. This remedy is not normally imposed unless a landlord has shown a blatant disregard for the Act and other remedies will not provide adequate deterrence and compliance.

46. Guideline 16 also provides the LTB with factors to consider with respect to quantum of the fine, which are:

- The nature and severity of the breach
- The effect of the breach on the tenant
- Any other relevant factors

47. In this case, I find that an administrative fine of \$10,000.00 is warranted to ensure compliance with the Act in the future especially given that the Tenants only met one of the three compensation remedies sought. The Landlord's bad faith conduct and actions toward these Tenants showed a blatant disregard for the Act.

48. One of the primary purposes of the Act is to provide protection for residential tenants from unlawful evictions. Therefore, in keeping with the spirit of the legislation the LTB has a great interest to deter landlords from engaging in this type of behaviour in the future.

49. The effect of the Landlord's breach on these Tenants was significant being an unlawful eviction which is the Act's paramount purpose. The Tenants were already vulnerable being international students and uneducated regarding the laws in the province. The Landlord owns at least one other investment property (rented), and this behaviour must be deterred.

T1 application

50. In this application, the Tenants allege that the Landlord failed to pay compensation to the Tenants in accordance with section 48.1 of the Act, failed to refund a key deposit collected, and did not pay any interest on the Tenants' last month's rent deposit.

Compensation

51. Section 48.1 of the Act provides that:

A landlord shall compensate a tenant in an amount equal to one month's rent or offer the tenant another rental unit acceptable to the tenant if the landlord gives the tenant a notice of termination of the tenancy under section 48.

52. Given the above findings, I was satisfied that the Landlord effectively gave the Tenants a notice to terminate their tenancy pursuant to section 48 of the Act as the real substance of the transaction of the N11 Form was to terminate the tenancy for the Landlord's own use. There was no dispute that the Landlord did not compensate the Tenants one month's rent as required by section 48.1 of the Act. Therefore, I find that the Tenants are entitled to one month's compensation. Consequently, the Landlord shall pay \$3,050.00 to the Tenants.

Key Deposit

53. There was no dispute that the Landlord collected a refundable key deposit of \$500.00 from the Tenants. The Landlord stated that there were three Tenants and when JL returned his keys he was refunded one third of the deposit being \$167.00, this was confirmed by JL. The other Tenants testified that they returned the keys on September 20, 2024 and provided into evidence a copy of the UPS Express post receipt and photo of the keys (DOC-7164314pg51-52).
54. Based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the Tenants have returned the keys to the Landlord and are therefore entitled to the full refundable deposit back. Since the Landlord already paid \$167.00 of that deposit to JL, not contested, the Tenants are entitled to remaining amount of \$333.00 which has been illegally retained by the Landlord. The Landlord shall pay \$333.00 to the Tenants.

Interest on the Last Month's Rent deposit

55. There was no dispute that the Landlord collected a last month's rent deposit of \$3,050.00 from the Tenants on August 31, 2023 as per the signed Agreement (DOC-7164314pg1). Subsection 106(6) of the Act provides that:

A landlord of a rental unit shall pay interest to the tenant annually on the amount of the rent deposit at a rate equal to the guideline determined under section 120 that is in effect at the time payment becomes due.

56. The Tenants last month's rent deposit was applied to the month of August 2024 the last month of the tenancy. The guideline percentage for 2024 was 2.5. Interest is owing up to the date the deposit was applied, August 31, 2023 to July 31, 2024, being 334 days. Therefore, the Tenants are entitled to interest on the last month's rent is the amount of \$69.77 ($\$3,050.00 \times .025/365 \times 334$).
57. The Tenants are entitled to \$48.00 for the costs of filing the application.

It is ordered that:

1. The total amount the Landlord shall pay the Tenants is \$18,500.77. This amount represents:
 - \$15,000.00 for general compensation.
 - \$3,050.00 for the compensation owing
 - \$333.00 for an illegally retained key deposit.
 - \$69.77 for interest on the last month's rent deposit.
 - \$48.00 for the cost of filing the application.
2. The Landlord shall pay the Tenants the full amount owing by July 4, 2026.
3. If the Landlord does not pay the Tenants the full amount owing by July 4, 2026, the Landlords will owe interest. This will be simple interest calculated from July 5, 2026 at 4.00% annually on the balance outstanding.

4. The Tenants have the right, at any time, to collect the full amount owing or any balance outstanding under this order.
5. The Landlord shall pay to the Landlord and Tenant Board an administrative fine in the amount of \$10,000.00 by July 4, 2026.

June 23, 2026
Date Issued

Lisa Del Vecchio
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.

Payment of the fine must be made to the LTB by the deadline set out above. If not paid, the outstanding amount may be sent to a collection agency and/or the party owing the money may not be permitted to file a new application until it is paid in accordance with section 196 the Act.

The fine can only be paid by money order, bank draft or certified cheque payable to the "Minister of Finance". The payment can be mailed or couriered to the LTB at 25 Grosvenor Street, Ground Floor, Toronto, ON M7A 2G6 or dropped off at most Service Ontario locations.