



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

Citation: MaHa INVESTHA HOLDINGS INC. C/O HAMID BIMESL v MORTEZA SEYEDI EGHBALI, 2026 ONLTB 50892

Date: 2026-06-26

File Number: LTB-L-106162-25-RV

In the matter of: BASEMENT, 238 RUMBLE AVE
RICHMOND HILL ON L4C4G7

Between: MaHa INVESTHA HOLDINGS INC. C/O HAMID BIMESL Landlord
HANNAH BIMESL

And

SEYED MORTEZA SEYEDI EGHBALI Tenants
SELENA MASHATZADEGAN

Review Order

MaHa INVESTHA HOLDINGS INC. C/O HAMID BIMESL and HANNAH BIMESL (the 'Landlord') applied for an order to terminate the tenancy and evict SEYED MORTEZA SEYEDI EGHBALI and SELENA MASHATZADEGAN (the 'Tenants') because the Tenants did not pay the rent that the Tenants owe.

This application was resolved by order LTB-L-106162-25 issued on May 26, 2026.

On June 25, 2026, the Tenant, Selena Mashatzadegan, 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 Tenant filed this review request on the basis of serious error. For the reasons set out below, the review request is denied.
2. The entirety of the Tenant's request reflects the Tenant's disagreement with the order and constitutes an attempt to reargue and reassess the evidence adduced at the hearing. The Tenant alleges that the rental unit is illegal, that the Landlord failed to investigate excessive noise complaints, and that the Landlord harassed the Tenant. However, paragraphs 1 to 14 of the order, addressing the Tenant's section 82 issues, demonstrate that these allegations were raised and considered at the hearing, and that the Tenant failed to establish them on a balance of probabilities.

3. The Board's review process is not an opportunity for a person to reargue an application that has been finally determined. Although the Tenant disagrees with the hearing member's finding, the hearing member was in the best position to receive and consider the parties' relevant evidence and submissions, and to make findings of credibility.
4. The order sets out in sufficient detail the reasons why the adjudicator arrived at his conclusions. The order, for example, states that the Tenant did not provide any documentary evidence to support their allegations. The Board's records also confirm that the Tenant did not file any supporting documents to substantiate their allegations. Dismissing the Tenant's claims was therefore reasonable and does not constitute a serious error.
5. The Tenant states that they now have evidence to support their allegations. Interpretation Guideline 8 - Review of an Order states:

Parties are expected to make every effort to produce all relevant evidence in support of their positions in the original hearing. The review will be dismissed unless the LTB is satisfied the new evidence could not have been produced at the original hearing, is material to the issues in dispute and its consideration could change the result. *First Homes Society v Henry*, [2002] O.J. No. 1754, (Div Ct.); NOL-16865-14- RV(Re), 2014 CanLII 78539 (ON LTB).

6. The Tenant has not established that the alleged new evidence could not have been produced at the original hearing. The purpose of the review process is not to provide parties with an opportunity of relitigating the issues in hopes of a better outcome.
7. Accordingly, I am not satisfied that there is a serious error in the order or that a serious error occurred in the proceedings.

It is ordered that:

1. The request to review order LTB-L-106162-25 issued on May 26, 2026 is denied. The order is confirmed and remains unchanged.

June 26, 2026
Date Issued

Mayra Sawicki
Member, Landlord and Tenants 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.