



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

Citation: Singh Mangat v Evans, 2026 ONLTB 50597

Date: 2026-06-25

File Number: LTB-L-019975-26-SA-RV

In the matter of: 1224 PARKINSON RD
WOODSTOCK ON N4S7W3

Between: Devinder Singh Mangat Landlord

And

Steve Evans Tenant

Review Order

Devinder Singh Mangat (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Steve Evans (the 'Tenant') because the Tenant did not pay the rent that the Tenant owes.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-019975-26-SA issued on May 27, 2026.

On June 25, 2026, the Tenant requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

1. In the review request the Tenant does not identify any serious errors in the order. Rather, the Tenant believes the order is unfair.
2. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order.
3. Essentially, the Tenant pleads that he is only less than two months behind on his rent and does not deserve to be evicted and that determination is harsh. He requests another opportunity.
4. The Tenant's claims related to the misidentification of occupants in the unit is not a serious error and does not change the outcome of the order.
5. Having reviewed the order, the presiding Member applied the appropriate legal test under s.78 (11) of the *Residential Tenancies Act, 2006* (the 'Act'), with no serious errors noted.

6. The order clearly sets out the parties' evidence and the Member's reasons to support the ultimate conclusion that the Tenant breached the terms of the agreement and having considered all of the circumstances, denied the Tenant's motion and lifted the stay. This decision falls within a reasonable range of outcomes.
7. The Tenant disagrees with the Member's findings and believes the Member should have come to a different conclusion.
8. The Board has published Guideline # 8, entitled "Review of an Order", in order to assist parties in understanding how the Board normally approaches issues that arise. It is not binding on me but I find it informative, useful and choose to follow it. As noted in Guideline # 8, errors of fact can be successful grounds for review but only where the error of fact which "was material to the decision, and **was clearly an unreasonable finding considering the evidence** which was before the Member" [emphasis added]. Here, the Tenant's request for review contains a wide rejection of the Member's findings of fact but there is nothing in the request for review suggestive of the possibility that there was no evidence to support the Member's findings of fact, or that the Member applied incorrect principles or considerations in arriving at his findings of fact, or that the findings were otherwise unreasonable or capricious.
9. The purpose of the review process is not to provide parties with an opportunity of presenting a better or different case than they did at first instance. I will not interfere with the assessment of the evidence by the Member of first instance, who had the opportunity of observing the witnesses and of hearing the evidence in its totality.
10. The Tenant has therefore not demonstrated that the May 27, 2026 order contains a serious error. The Tenant review request must be denied.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-019975-26 issued on May 27, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

June 25, 2026
Date Issued

Dana Wren
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.