



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

File Number: LTB-L-109228-25-RV

In the matter of: 2349 MCNICOLL AVE
SCARBOROUGH ON M1V5L4

Between: Yee Hong Chinese Evergreen Non-Profit Homes Landlord

And

Nik-Keisha Moodie Tenant
Jahzil Hall
Jahlia Moodie-Hall
Jahaniel Jackson
Jahkobe Peters

Review Order

Yee Hong Chinese Evergreen Non-Profit Homes (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict Nik-Keisha Moodie, Jahzil Hall, Jahlia Moodie-Hall, Jahaniel Jackson and Jahkobe Peters (the 'Tenants') because:

- the Tenants did not pay the rent that the Tenants owe (L1 Application); and
- the Tenants have been persistently late in paying the Tenants' rent; (L2 Application).

The Landlord also claimed compensation for each day the Tenants remained in the unit after the termination date.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-109228-25 issued on February 18, 2026.

On May 27, 2026, the Tenants requested a review of the order.

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

Determinations:

Request to extend time

1. The Tenants' request to extend time to file this review request is granted.

Review request

1. The order under review was made on consent of the parties. The review request does not assert that the terms in the order fail to reflect the terms to which the parties agreed at the hearing.
2. The review request submits that the Tenants were not reasonably able to anticipate a processing delay for a government benefit upon which the Tenants relied to be able to comply with the terms to which they agreed. This is not a valid reason for a review request. The Tenants were able to, and did, participate in the proceedings. That an event took place, or a circumstance manifested, after the order was issued is not an error of the LTB, nor does it give rise to material new evidence that was not available at the hearing with the exercise of due diligence. New evidence must be of a situation in existence at the time of 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. The review request does not provide a sufficient reason to revisit the consent order.
6. On the basis of the submissions made in the request, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order or that a serious error occurred in the proceedings or that the Tenants were not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-109228-25 issued on February 18, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

June 26, 2026
Date Issued

Renée Lang
Vice Chair, 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.