



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

Citation: SCOTT v Agbo, 2026 ONLTB 50402

Date: 2026-06-25

File Number: LTB-L-027413-26-RV

In the matter of: 1407, 49 WALNUT ST S
HAMILTON ON L8N2K9

Between: PETER SCOTT

Landlord

And

Desmond Agbo
BELLA OPARE

Tenant

Review Order

PETER SCOTT (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Desmond Agbo and BELLA OPARE (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-027413-26 issued on June 1, 2026 issued on consent pursuant to a hearing held on May 28, 2026 attended by the Landlord and the Tenant.

On June 24, 2026, the Tenant, Bella Opare ("Ms. Opare"), requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. Ms. Opare submits they were not able to reasonably participate in the proceeding despite attending and agreeing to a consent order, as they were under significant emotional distress, fear, and anxiety. Ms. Opare wishes the Board to review this matter as Ms. Opare states she was meant to be a guarantor and not a tenant of the rental unit and wishes to address this argument to the Board.
2. A review is not an opportunity to revisit a consent order of the Board issued pursuant to an agreement reached by the parties, or to present evidence and submissions that could have and should have been presented at the hearing.
3. 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)

4. 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)
5. Further, Ms. Opare does not identify what circumstances would have put them in such a state of heightened distress that they were unable to reasonably participate in the hearing, or why if they were in such a state a request for an adjournment was not made. I find the request does not contain sufficient information to make a preliminary finding that Ms. Opare was not reasonably able to participate in the hearing as required by LTB Rule 26.8.e.
6. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that the Tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the proceedings.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-027413-26 issued on June 1, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

June 25, 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.